DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 522 HE 012 796

AUTHOR	Wallace, Grace Spice; May, W. Theodore
TITLE	Longitudinal Career Pattern Study of Graduates of the University of Tennessee College of Nursing, 1954 through 1974. Volume 2.
INSTITUTION	Tennessee Univ., Memphis.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	587p.; For related document see ED 183 126.
EDRS PRICE	MF03/PC24 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement; Awards; *Career Choice; Community Involvement; *Education Work Relationship; Followup Studies; *Job Satisfaction; Longitudinal Studies; *Nurses; *Nursing Education; Occupational Mobility; Professional Continuing Education; Professional Development; Professional Recognition; Recognition (Achievement); Spouses
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Findings on those aspects of participants' activities related to personal history and career choices both before and after graduation are reported in this second of a two-volume report on the findings of the Longitudinal Career Pattern Study of Graduates of the University of Tennessee College of Nursing, 1954-1974. The first two chapters describe the background of respondents (occupations and education of parents, birth order and number, financial aid) and personal history since graduation (residency, marital status, age and family situation, and spouse's occupation). Chapter Three focuses on the attitudes towards nursing, career satisfaction, spouse's attitude towards career nurses, and friendship among respondents. Professional and voluntary activities are then outlined, followed by an explanation of professional achievements, consultations, and publishing, research, and speaking activities. The next chapter deals with continuous nursing careers, including career choice, activities, and professional achievements. Criticism and suggestions for improving the questionnaire used in this study are offered. Among the conclusions are that: half the respondents reported being only children or eldest children; the South retained over 80 percent of the respondents as residents; 85 percent of spouses of respondents fell into professional and business related categories; the three most highly ranked reasons for being employed in nursing, beyond the financial one, were personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others; and a 4-to-1 ratio was reported on spouses' favorable attitudes towards nursing employment. (LC)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED188522

LONGITUDINAL CAREER PATTERN STUDY

of

GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE COLLEGE OF NURSING

1954 through 1974

VOLUME 2

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Grace Spice
Wallace
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 796

Memphis, Tennessee
1980

Grace Spice Wallace, B.S.
W. Theodore May, Ph.D.

Volume 2

FORWARD

This publication is the second of a two volume report on the findings of the Longitudinal Career Pattern Study of Graduates of The University of Tennessee College of Nursing, 1954–1974.

Volume 1 includes the description of the study, the characteristics of the target population and the participants, the identification of the geographic regions from which participants came to attend The University of Tennessee College of Nursing and those aspects of the participants' activities after graduation that relate to post-baccalaureate education and employment and the participants' evaluation of their level of preparation for practice. It also includes a comparison of the activities of a modal group of respondents who were continuously active in nursing since graduation and a control group of their classmates who were less active.

Volume 2 includes findings on those aspects of the participants' activities that relate to personal history and career choices both before and after graduation and professional and community activities after graduation.

3

Volume 2

FORWARD ii
CONTENTS iii
LIST OF TABLES v

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Volume 2 xix

CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS 1
- Occupations of Parents 1
- Education of Parents 14
- Sibling Birth Order and Number 25
- Financial Aid for UTCN Program 29

CHAPTER 2. PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION 32
- Region of Residence Since Graduation 32
- Marital Status 36
- Time of First Marriage 44
- Fiancé's Activity at Time of Engagement 47
- Age and Family Situation of Respondent 54
- Husbands's Occupation 63

CHAPTER 3. CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTIONS 73
- Career Choice 73
- Respondent's Perceptions of Public Attitudes Toward Nursing as a Career 77
- Most Important Nursing Position 87
- Career Satisfactions/Dissatisfactions 90
- Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing 93
- Reconsideration of Career Choice 101
- Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse 106
- Lasting Friendships Among Respondents 110

4

CHAPTER 4. PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES 113

Professional Activities 113

Voluntary Health and Welfare Organization Activities 133

Voluntary Community Organization Activities 136

Nursing Journal Subscriptions 138

CHAPTER 5. HONORS AND PROFESSIONAL ACHEIVEMENTS 142

Honors and Awards 142

Professional Achievements 148

Consultations 148

Public Speaking Activities 152

Publishing Activities 160

Research Activities 162

CHAPTER 6. CONTINUOUS NURSING CAREERS 165

Background of Respondents 165

Personal History Since Graduation 179

Career Choice and Career Satisfaction 189

Professional and Community Activities 205

Honors and Professional Achievements 206

Criticism and Suggestions for Improvement of the Questionnaire 218

Summary of Findings – Chapter 6 219

CHAPTER 7. CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE 221

Criticism of Questionnaire 222

Suggestions for Improvement 223

Suggestions for Improving Services to Graduates from College and Alumnae Association 224

Significant Things Omitted from Questionnaire 228

APPENDIX 234

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

OCCUPATION OF PARENTS

Table — Page

Q 3 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Father or Guardian 1

Q 3 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Father's Occupation in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 3

Q 3 #3. Summary Table. Percent of Responses for 7 Categories of Father's Occupation by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 4

Q 3 #4. Percent of Responses for Father's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program . . . 5

Q 5 #1. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents at Time of Admission to UTCN 6

Q 5 #2. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers at Time of Respondent's Admission to UTCN, by Class 7

Q 5 #3. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents by Decade Groupings of Classes 8

Q 5 #4. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 8

Q 5 #5. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in NLN, UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 9

Q 5 #6. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program 10

Q 6 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Mother 11

Q 6 #2. Percent of Responses for 8 Occupations of Mothers by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 12

Q 6#3. Percent of Responses for Occupations of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program . 13

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

Q 7 #1. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Father of Respondent 14

Q 7 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers of Respondents in 3 Studies 14

Q 7 #3. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Mother of Respondent 15

Q 7 #4. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in 3 Studies 16

Q 7 #5. Percent of Responses for 4 Levels of Education Completed by Total Population of Fathers and Mothers of Respondents and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 17

Q 7 #6. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Fathers, by Respondents' UTCN Program 19

Q 7 #7. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program 20

Q 4 #1. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers 21

Q 4 #2. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 21
Q 4 #3. Percent of Mothers who were Registered Nurses by Class 22
Q 4 #4. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Respondents' Mothers, by Two Groupings of Classes 23
Q 4 #5. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program 24

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER AND NUMBER

Q 8 #1. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options 25
Q 8 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options by Baccalaureate Program Respondents in NLN Study 25
Q 8 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options by Respondents' UTCN Program 25
Q 9 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings 26
Q 9 #2. Percent of Responses for Living Siblings by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 27
Q 9 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings by Respondents' UTCN Program 28

FINANCIAL AID FOR UTCN PROGRAM

Q 2 #1. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid 29
Q 2 #2. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid by Respondents' UTCN Program. 29
Q 2 #3. Percent of Generic Program Respondents Who Received/Did not Receive Aid by 3 Class Groupings Based on Availability of Federal Funds 31

CHAPTER 2

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

REGION OF RESIDENCE SINCE GRADUATION

Q 47 #1. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation 32
Q 47#2. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 33
Q 47 #3. Percent of Responses for Region of Origin, Residence after Graduation and Employment, Q One and Q Two 34
Q 47 #4. Percent of Responses for U.S. Regions and Foreign Country of Residence Since Graduation by Respondents' UTCN Program 35

MARITAL STATUS

Q 49 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options 36
Q 49 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 37
Q 49 #3. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Class 38
Q 49 #4. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program. 39
Q 49 #5. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status Q Two 40
Q 49 #6. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two 40
Q 49 #7. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status Q Two, by Respondents' UTCN Program 41
Q49 #8. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two, by Respondents' UTCN Program 41
Q 49 #9. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Marital Status Options 42
Q 49 #10. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Change in Marital Status Q Two 42
Q 49 #11. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two. 42
Q49#12. Percent of Responses from Selected UTCN and NLN Respondents for 3 Categories of Marital Status by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 43

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

Q 51 #1. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage 44
Q 51 #2. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage by Respondents' UTCN Program 45
Q 51 #3. Responses of Generic Program Respondents for Five Options for Time of First Marriage, Using Point System, by Class 46

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

Q 52 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement . . 47
Q 52 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement, by Respondents' UTCN Program 48
Q 52 #3. Percent of Responses for Fiancé Attendance at UT Medical Units by College/School/ Program 49
Q52 #4. Percent of Responses for Four Medical Units Colleges for Fiancé Attendance, by Respondent's Class 50

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

Q 48 #1. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories 54
Q 48 #2. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories by Respondents' UTCN Program 55
Q 48 #3. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories, Q Two 57
Q 48 #4. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Age and Family Situation Categories, by Q One and Q Two 59
Q 50 #1. Percent of Responses for 7 Options for Number of Living Children 61
Q 50 #2. Percent of Responses for 7 Options of Number of Living Children by Respondents' UTCN Program 62

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

Q 55 #1. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband 63
Q 55 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband 64
Q 55 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband by Class 65
Q 55 #4. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Two Graduation–Response Intervals 67
Q 55 #5. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Professions of Husbands 68
Q 55 #6. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program . 68
Q 55 #7. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband in 4 Categories by Respondents' UTCN Program 69
Q 55 #8. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Profession of Husband, by Respondents' UTCN Program 70
Q 53 #1. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces, by Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval 71
Q 53 #2. Percent of Responses for Husband's Status with Armed Forces by Respondents' UTCN Program 72
Q 53 #3. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces by Respondents' UTCN Program, Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval 72

CHAPTER 3

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTIONS

CAREER CHOICE

Q 57 #1. Percent of Responses for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing . 73
Q 57 #2. Percent of Responses (Reorganized) for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing 75
Q 57 #3. Percent of Responses for Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program 76

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

Q 58 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing 78
Q 58 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program 79
Q 58 #3. Percent of Responses for Approving and Disapproving Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' Class 80
Q 58 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q Two 81
Q 58 #5. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two 82
Q 58 #6. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two 82
Q 58 #7. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 83
Q 58 #8. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing for Two Year–Seven Year Sample 84
Q 58 #9. Mean Ratings of Responses from Various Populations for Perceived Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing of Three Classes of General Public 85

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

Q 24 #1. Percent of Responses for Position Rated Most Important 87
Q 24 #2. Percent of Responses for Positions Held for One Year or More, Currently Held and Most Important 88
Q 24 #3. Percent of Responses for Most Important Position by Respondents' UTCN Program. 89

CAREER SATISFACTIONS/DISSATISFACTIONS

Q 30 #1. Reasons (Non-financial) for Present Employment Ranked for Importance 90
Q 30 #2. Ranking of Reasons for Present Employment by Various Point Systems 91

FEELINGS ABOUT NOT BEING EMPLOYED IN NURSING

Q 41 #1. Percent of Responses for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing 93
Q 41 #2. Percent of Responses for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents 93
Q 41 #3. Percent of Responses for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 94
Q 42 #1. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About Not Being Active in Nursing 95
Q 42 #2. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About Not being Active in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents 95

Q 42 #3. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About Not Being Active in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 96
Q 59 #1. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields . . . 97
Q 59 #2. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 97
Q 59 #3. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program 98
Q 59 #4. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q Two 98
Q 59 #5. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q One and Q Two. 99
Q 59 #6. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 99
Q 59 #7. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields for Two Year–Seven Year Sample 100

RECONSIDERATION OF CAREER CHOICE

Q 60 #1. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career 101
Q 60 #2. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 101
Q 60 #3. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program 102
Q 60 #4. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career Q Two .102
Q 60 #5. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career Q One and Q Two 103
Q 60 #6. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 103
Q 60 #7. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choice Q Two 104
Q 60 #8. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choice by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 105

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

Q 54 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse 106
Q 54 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse by 2 Graudation–Response Intervals 106
Q 54 #3. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse by Respondents' UTCN Program .107
Q 54 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse for Respondents Married or Remarried Since Q One 108
Q 54 #5. Percent of Responses for Type of Change in Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse Since Q One 108

LASTING FRIENDSHIPS AMONG RESPONDENTS

Q 56 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are Now Friends 110
Q 56 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are Now Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program 110
Q 56 #3. Mean Number of Fellow Students Counted as Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class 111

CHAPTER 4

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Q 61 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options 113
Q 61 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' Program UTCN 113
Q 62 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation 115
Q 62 #2. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and by Respondents' UTCN Program 116
Q 62 #3. Summary Table. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 117
Q 62 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two 120
Q 63 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options 121
Q 63 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program 121
Q 64 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation 123
Q 64 #2. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and by Respondents' UTCN Program 124
Q 64 #3. Summary Table. Percent of Points for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 125
Q 64 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two 128
Q 65 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations 129
Q 65#2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 129

Q 65 #3. Percent of Responses for One and Two Memberships in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 130
Q 66 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations 131
Q66#2. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 132

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Q 68 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations 133
Q68#2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 134

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Q 69 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations 136
Q69#2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 136

NURSING JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Q 70 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions 138
Q 70 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program 138
Q 70 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class 139

CHAPTER 5

HONORS AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

HONORS AND AWARDS

Q 67 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships 142
Q 67 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships by Respondents' UTCN Program 142
Q 67 #3. Percent of Responses for Membership in One, Two and More Honorary Societies by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 143
Q 71 #1. Distribution of Sigma Theta Tau Membership by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Chapter 146

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

CONSULTANTS

Q 71 #2. Consultations, Subjects and Organizations, Q One 148
Q 71 #3. Consultations, Subjects and Organizations, Q Two 150

PUBLIC SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities, Subjects and Audiences, Q One 152
Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities, Subjects and Audiences, Q Two 155

PUBLISHING ACTIVITIES

List of Publications Q One 160
List of Publications Q Two 160

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

List of Research Projects Q One 162
List of Research Projects Q Two 163

CHAPTER 6

CONTINUOUS NURSING CAREERS

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

OCCUPATION OF FATHER

MG #1. Summary Table. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Occupation of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 166

EMPLOYED/NOT EMPLOYED STATUS OF MOTHER

MG #2. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 168

OCCUPATION OF MOTHER

MG #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 169

EDUCATION OF FATHER

MG #4. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 170

14

EDUCATION OF MOTHER

MG #5. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 171

COMPARISON OF EDUCATION COMPLETED BY FATHER AND MOTHER

MG #6. Percent of Responses for 2 Educational Levels of Father and Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 173

NURSING EDUCATION OF MOTHER

MG #7. Percent of Responses for Level of Nursing Education Completed by Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 174

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER

MG #8. Percent of Responses for Birth Order Among Siblings for Modal and Non-modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 176

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

MG #9. Percent of Responses for Number of Siblings for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 177

FINANCIAL AID FOR UTCN PROGRAM

MG #10. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 178

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

MARITAL STATUS

MG #11. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One 179
MG #12. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q Two 180

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

MG #13. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 182

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

MG #14. Percent of Responses for Activity of Fiancé at time of Engagement for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 183

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

MG #15. Summary Table. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Age, Marital Status and Age of Children for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Q One and Q Two 184
MG #16. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Children for Modal and Non-modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 185
MG #17. Average Number of Living Children per Respondent for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 186

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

MG #18. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 187
MG #19. Percent of Responses for Husband's Profession for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 188

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTION

CAREER CHOICE

MG #20. Percent of Responses for Factor That Most Influenced Choice of Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 189

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

MG #21. Average Values for Most to Least Favorable Attitudes Toward Nursing as a Career as Perceived by Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One and Q Two 192

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

MG #22. Percent of Responses for Type of Most Important Position for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 194

CAREER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION

MG #23. Percent of Aggregate Points and Mean Rank for Responses to 6 Reasons (non financial) for Present Employment for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 196

MG #24. Average Points for Attractiveness of Work in Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One and Q Two 198

RECONSIDERATION OF CAREER CHOICE

MG #25. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 199

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

MG #26. Percent of Responses for 5 Attitudes of Husband re Employment as a Nurse for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One 201

LASTING FRIENDSHIPS OF RESPONDENTS

MG #27. Percent of Responses for Number of Classmates Counted as Friends for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 204

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

POST BACCALAUREATE EDUCATION

MG #28. Number of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Reporting Master's Degrees by Major and by Class 205

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

MG #29. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 207
MG #30. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at 3 Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes . . .209
MG #31. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 210
MG #32. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at 3 Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes . . .211
MG #33. Percent of Responses for Membership in Other Professional Organizations by Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 213
MG #34. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents in Other Professional Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes 214

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

MG #35. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non-modal Respondents for Number of Memberships on Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes 215

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

MG #36. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes . . .216

PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

MG #37. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Journal Subscriptions by 2 Groups of Classes 217

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS, PUBLIC ADDRESSES, PUBLICATIONS AND

RESEARCH PROJECTS

MG#38. Percent of Respondents in Modal and Non–modal Groups Reporting Professional Activities by 2 Groups of Classes, Q One and Q Two 218

CHAPTER 7

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNARIE

List of favorable Comments 221
List of Criticisms of Questionnaire 222
List of Suggestions for Improvement of the Questionnaire 223
List of Suggestions for Improving Services to Graduates from the College and the Alumnae Association 224
List of Signficant Things Omitted from the Questionnaire 228

APPENDIX

A 1. Percent of Responses for 7 Categories of Occupations of Fathers of Respondents, by Class 234
A 2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupations of Mothers of Respondents, by Class 235
A 3. Average Points for 7 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers and Mothers of Respondents, by Class and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 236
A. 4. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Generic Program Respondents, by Class 238

A 5. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage Related to First Enrollment, by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class 239
A 6. Percent of Aggregate Score in Points Derived from Responses for 6 Reasons for Employment, by Class and Respondents' UTCN Program 241
A 7. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 242
A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class 243
A 9. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents, by Class 246
A 10. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options, by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 249
A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class 250
A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents, by Class 253
A 13. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Father by Modal and Non–modal Respondents and by 2 Groups of Classes 256
A 14. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Age of Respondents and Ages of Children, Q One and Q Two 257

SUMMARY

Some of the major findings presented in Volume 2 are summarized below.

On the subject of family background of respondents, it was established that the occupations of approximately 70% of the fathers of respondents fell into the categories of profession, business offical, proprietor, farm owner and skilled operator and that, over time, the proportion of fathers in the first three categories increased while it decreased in the remaining two categories.

The proportion of mothers who were employed at the time the respondent enrolled at UTCN was consistently below the estimated national rate for employment among mothers but the proportion did increase, over time, to approach the national rate.

The occupations of approximately 70% of the employed mothers fell into the categories of profession, clerical worker and service worker and, over time, the proportion of mothers increased in only one or these, namely clerical worker.

On the subject of the level of education completed by parents of respondents, it was established that a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had less than high school graduation but a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had graduated from college and done post graduate work while a greater proportion of mothers than fathers were high school and vocational/technical graduates. The level of education completed by fathers and by mothers increased, over time, for both, with fathers beginning at a lower level and ending at a higher level than did mothers. There was a trend toward more respondents in later Classes having a registered nurse mother than was the case in earlier Classes.

Half the respondents reported being only children or oldest children. There was a trend toward decreasing numbers of siblings in the family of the respondent over time.

On the subject of financial aid for respondents while they were enrolled at UTCN, it was evident that as financial assistance became available through the Professional Nurse Traineeship Program for Registered Nurses, the National Student Defense Loan Program and the Nurse Training Act Program the proportion of respondents that used them as sources of financial aid through UTCN increased while the proportion that sought financial assistance from other sources, including part–time employment, decreased from their peaks in the early 1960s.

On the subject of personal history since graduation it was established that "the South" retained over 80% of the respondents as residents during the period of the study and that respondents who stayed in the East South Central Region (including Tennessee) had approximately the same rate of employment in nursing as did the total population of respondents, regardless of location.

On the subject of marital status it was evident that approximately 80% of respondents were currently or had previously been married; the rate of divorce indicated that respondents maintained more stable marital relationships than the total U.S. population of the same sex and age groupings.

A tendency toward earlier marriages was evident among respondents in earlier Classes while the trend was toward later marriage among respondents in the later Classes. Two thirds of the respondents who married did so while attending UTCN or within one year after graduation; one out of every two respondents who married in this time span married a person who was either a student in a College at the UT Medical Units or a qualified practitioner in a health related field.

Since 53% of the respondents to the first questionnaire answered it just two years after graduation, it was not surprising to find that approximately 40% of them were childless at that time; nor was it surprising that in the second sampling, five years later, this proportion had dropped to 8% of those who responded; respondents with children up to 13 years of age constituted 42% of respondents on the first sampling and approximately 60% on the second sampling; the registered nurse program respondents were older than the generic program respondents; in the 25 to 45 year age bracket a greater proportion of the registered nurse program graduates had never married than was the case for generic program respondents in the same age bracket; the proportion of respondents in each program group that had children was the same, 57%; the average number of children per respondent was the same for both program groups on the first sampling, 1.17.

The occupations of approximately 85% of husbands of respondents fell into professional and business related categories; 68% of the husbands who followed a profession were in the health related professions.

On the subject of career choice it was established that approximately 30% of the respondents could not identify precisely what factor most influenced their choice of nursing as a career; family influences were identified by one fourth and nurses and other health related factors were identified by another fourth of the respondents as being the most important factor in their choices; teachers and active recruitment by nursing were identified by very few respondents as being the most important factor in their choice of nursing as a career.

Overall, respondents perceived that persons in the lower and middle classes of the general public felt favorably toward a career in nursing while persons in the upper class, although they approved of nursing as a career, felt less strongly about it and were indifferent to it to a greater degree; there was evidence of a slight shift, over time, toward perception of a more favorable attitude toward a career in nursing on the part of the general public.

On the subject of career satisfactions, the three most highly ranked reasons for being employed in nursing, beyond the financial one, were personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others; the three remaining options, career commitment, the people met on the job, and scholarship or traineeship commitment were ranked in sharply descending order.

Among respondents who were not employed in nursing, more expressed regret that they were not, in a ratio of 2 to 1, than indicated that they had no desire to be employed; among the total population the feelings about the attractiveness of nursing compared to work in other fields became increasingly positive related to the recency of graduation and the shorter period of time between graduation and recording the feelings. The likelihood of respondent thinking they would choose nursing again, on the basis of present knowledge, was consistently 80% or better; the writers suggest that the existance of the remaining respondents who expressed dissatisfaction with their choice, merits attention.

Married respondents, in a ratio of 4 to 1 reported favorable attitudes on the part of their husbands toward their being employed as nurses.

Respondents reported having an average of from four to five friends among former UTCN students and this average number was consistent regardless of differences in the length of time since graduation.

On the subject of activities, in addition to the practice of nursing, that are traditionally considered to be criteria of professionalism, previous and current membership in the American Nurses' Association was reported by 2 out of 3 generic program respondents and 9 out of 10 registered nurse program respondents; current membership alone was reported by 1 out of 3 of the former and 2 out of 3 of the latter; the percent of members who reported active and leadership participation in ANA was 33% at the local level, 15% at the state level and 3% at the national level; the registered nurse program respondent members reported a higher rate of active and leadership participation than did the generic program respondent members.

Current and previous membership in the National League for Nursing was reported by 1 out of 5 generic program respondents and 5 out of 10 registered nurse program respondents; current membership alone was reported by less than 1 out of 10 generic program respondents and by 3 out of 10 registered nurse program respondents; the percent of members who reported active and leadership participation in NLN was 35% at the local level, 25% at the state level and 5% at the national level; the registered nurse program respondent members reported a higher rate of active and leadership participation than did generic program respondent members.

Approximately 1 out of 5 respondents reported membership in one or more professional organizations other than ANA and NLN; the patterns of membership and participation for respondents in the two program groups were similar to the patterns identified in relation to ANA and NLN.

Approximately 1.5 out of 5 respondents reported membership in one or more voluntary health and welfare organization and 3 out of 5 reported membership in one or more voluntary community organization such as religious, political, civic or educational groups.

Current subscriptions to one or more nursing journals were reported by 3 out of 5 respondents; on the average, registered nurse program respondents subscribed to 1.5 journals, while generic program respondents subscribed to 0.8 journals per respondent.

As would be expected, the proportion of respondents who reported serving as consultants and public speakers, who published professionally and who participated in research projects increased over time; public speaking was the activity that was reported most frequently in both samplings but its rate of increase, over time, was less than that for the other three activities.

Responses from a modal group of generic program respondents who were continuously active in nursing throughout the period of the study were compared with responses from a control group of their classmates who were less active.

There were some differences in the family backgrounds of the respondents in these two groups. On the basis of education and occupation of the father, the families of modal group respondents represented a somewhat lower socio–economic class than did the families of the non–modal respondents; mothers of the modal respondents completed a higher level of education, on the average, and were employed outside the home to a greater degree, than were the mothers of non–modal respondents; modal respondents were members of slightly smaller families, on the average, than were non–modal respondents.

Respondents in the non–modal group married earlier and they married and remained married in greater numbers, than was the case with respondents in the modal group; they married men in the professions, notably the health related professions, in higher proportions than did their classmates in the modal group; they had more children and a greater proportion of children under 13 years of age than did the modal group respondents; they percieved their husbands as having less favorable attitudes toward their employment as nurses than did the married modal group respondents.

The responses from the two groups regarding factors that influenced the career choices they made were similar with one exception, the influence of persons in nursing and other health related fields was identified as important by more modal than non–modal respondents and the importance of this influence increased, over time, among them.

The attitudes they perceived the general public to have in relation to nursing as a career were, overall, favorable for both groups of respondents; however, the modal respondents perceived the attitude of the lower class to be more favorable and the attitudes of the middle and upper classes to be less favorable while the reverse was the case for the non–modal respondents; there was a shift toward perception of a more favorable attitude on the part of the middle and upper classes by respondents in both groups, over time.

Excluding financial reasons for being employed in nursing, respondents in both groups ranked their reasons similarly, citing personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others as relatively equally important and well above career commitment, people met on the job and scholarship/traineeship commitment.

Knowing what they knew when they made their responses, respondents in both groups reported that they would choose nursing again in a ratio of 4 to 1 if they had the decision to make again; modal respondents gave nursing a slightly better rating than did their non–modal classmates when asked to compare work in nursing with work in other fields.

Modal respondents reported having earned the master's degree in greater numbers than did non–modal respondents and more of their degrees had the major in nursing. As was to be expected they participated in professional organizations, subcribed to nursing journals, served as consultants and public speakers, partitipated in research and publications to a greater degree than did the non–modal respondents.

Model respondents suggested improvements in the services the College and the Alumnae Association provide the graduates that were directed predominantly to the College and concerned educational offerings, master's programs, while non–modal respondents suggested improvements in non educational alumnae services.

A higher proportion of modal than non–modal respondents requested the report of the findings of the longitudinal career pattern study.

The opportunity to criticize the questionnaire used in the second sampling was utilized by 12% of those who responded. These criticisms were distributed between favorable and unfavorable comments in a 1 to 2 ratio.

Suggestions for improvement of the questionnaire and requests for a report of the findings were made by 7% of respondents.

Suggestions for improvement of services to graduates from the College and the Alumnae Association were made by 20% of the respondents; these suggestions were equally divided between those dealing with the need respondents expressed to continue their professional education on the master's level and those dealing strictly with communication with and participation in the Alumnae Association.

The opportunity to identify things that were significant to them that the questionnaire had not included was utilized by 18% of respondents. Approximately half the significant things so identified had to do with the lives of the respondents as persons but not full–time employed nurses; this finding lent support to one criticism that was made of the questionnaire, that it was slanted toward those respondents who were active in nursing and those who had continued their formal education in nursing beyond the baccalaureate degree.

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

The background of the respondents was the first subject addressed in the second volume of the report of the study of the career patterns of graduates of The University of Tennessee College of Nursing 1954-1974.

OCCUPATION OF PARENTS

Information on the subject of father's occupation was requested in *Question 3 Q One:

"When you first entered the University of Tennessee School/College of Nursing Programs, what was the primary occupation of your father or guardian? (Circle one)."

There were 522 usable **responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency by occupational category in Table Q 3 #1.

Table Q 3 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Father of Guardian

Primary Occupation Father or Guardian	Responses N	%
Profession (teacher, doctor, lawyer, engineer, minister)	92	17.6
Business official or executive (manager, buyer, supervisor, personnel director)	90	17.2
Proprietor (self-employed business man, store owner, contractor, distributor)	81	15.5
Farm owner or manager	56	10.7
Skilled operator or machine operator (factory machine worker, bus driver)	38	7.3
Technician or semi-professional worker (lab technician, draftsman)	31	5.9
Clerical worker (bookkeeper, office machine operator)	18	3.4
Laborer	18	3.4
Service worker (policeman, fireman, waiter, barber, cook)	16	3.1
Other	16	3.1
Deceased	6	1.1
Retired	3	0.6
Farm worker	2	0.4
Total	522	99.8

---

*In this report the questions are not necessarily considered in the sequence in which they appeared in the questionnaires but rather, in such a way, as to present the data most logically and coherently.

**For response rates see Volume 1 Table A 1, Appendix A. The fact that 533 copies of Q One were returned does not mean that there are 533 responses recorded for every item in the reporting. Not every respondent answered every question; some questions answered were applicable to only a segment of the population. Thus, the total number of responses that forms the basis for statistical consideration on any one question is identified as the number of usable responses.

When respondents marked the retired or deceased option, they were asked to identify the father's former occupation. The former occupations that were specified were included in the count for the listed occupations. Therefore, the counts for the categories of retired and deceased include only those responses for which no former occupation was specified.

When respondents marked the "other" option, they were asked to specify an occupation. Some of the occupations that were specified could be included in the count for the listed occupations and this was done in the following cases:

the occupations of journalist, military officer, electron microscopist, certified public accountant and pilot were counted in the category of profession;

the occupations of service station operator and real estate agent were counted in the category of proprietor.

The occupations of the fathers that remained in the count of "other" responses were distributed as follows:

6 were postal clerks; 2 were foremen in industry; 2 were engaged in two occupations simultaneously, those of farm owner and factory worker; 1 father was described as disabled; in one instance it appeared that the respondent was describing a guardian rather than a father since the occupation was designated as seamstress; in two instances, the respondent had no knowledge of the father's occupation and in two instances no information was given.

The findings presented in Table Q 3 #1 indicated that

five occupational categories accounted for 71.5% of the primary occupations of the fathers of respondents, namely, profession, business official, proprietor, farm owner and skilled operator.

A comparison was made between the occupations of fathers of respondents who attended UTCN and Vanderbilt[1] School of Nursing. This comparison is limited to respondents who attended the generic program at UTCN and the four and five year baccalaureate programs at Vanderbilt. The responses for the 14 occuaptional options are grouped into the 4 large categories used in the report of the Vanderbilt study, namely, profession; business executive and proprietor; retired or decreased and "other" including salesman, clerical worker, farm owner, farm worker, technician, skilled operator, service worker, laborer and other.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 3 #2.

Table Q 3 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Father's Occupation in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Occupation of Fathers of Respondents	UTCN Generic Program Graduates Responses		Vanderbilt Four and Five Year Bacca. Prog. Graduates Responses	
	*N	%	**N	%
Professional	87	19.3	108	23.1
Business exec. & proprietors	145	32.2	205	43.9
Retired and deceased	5	1.1	68	14.6
All other	214	47.5	86	18.4
Total	451	100.1	467	100.1

No explanation is proposed in the report of the Vanderbilt study for the high proportion of responses in the category of deceased and retired fathers. The UTCN rate is more in line with expectations. The marked difference in the proportion of responses in the remaining categories may be related to the considerable difference in the costs of the two programs.

It was not possible to compare the data concerning the occupation of fathers of respondents in the UTCN study with the data in the NLN[2] study because of the lack of similarity of the categories used in the two studies. In the NLN study the respondent was asked to name the father's occupation and these responses were then categorized by the investigators.

---

[1] Donaldson, Mary Louise and Hereford, Julia J. A Study of School of Nursing Graduates 1930-1963 Vanderbilt University School of Nursing. Nashville 1965.

[2] Knopf, L., From Student to RN. DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 72-130 Table 21 p. 58

*Derived from Table Q 3 #4

**Donaldson, M.L., Table 5 p. 13

The percent of responses for 7 categories of occupations for respondents' fathers is presented, by Class, in Table A 1 in the Appendix.

The percent of responses for 7 categories of occupations of respondents' fathers, by 2 decade groupings of Classes is presented in Summary Table Q 3 #3.

Summary Table Q 3 #3. Percent of Response for 7 Categories of Father's Occupation by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

Occupation of Respondents' Fathers	Classes 1954-1964 Responses N	%	1965-1974 Responses N	%
Profession	33	13.6	59	21.1
Proprietor and business official	76	31.3	95	34.1
Salesman, clerical worker and technician	34	14.0	53	19.0
Farm owner and manager	40	16.5	16	5.7
Skilled operator and service worker	35	14.4	36	12.9
Farm worker and laborer	12	4.9	8	2.8
Retired, deceased, "other"	13	5.3	12	4.4
Total	243	100.0	279	100.0

The findings in Table A 1 and Table Q 3 #3 indicated that

the proportion of responses from graduates after 1964 was greater than from graduates prior to and including 1964 by more than 3 percentage points in only two occupational categories of fathers, namely, profession (7.5%) and salesman, clerical worker and technician (5.0%); it was less in only one category, that of farm owner and manager (10.8%).

The calculated Chi Square for independence for the 522 responses was 21.67. At the .05 level of significance for 6 degrees of freedom, the Chi Square critical value was 12.952. Therefore, the occupations of the responsents' fathers at the time the respondents entered UTCN were not independent of the calendar year of the respondents' enrollment.

A comparsion was made of the number and percent of responses recorded for each occupational option in Question 3 by respondents who graduated from the generic program and from the registered nurse program.

These findings are presented in Table Q 3 #4.

Table Q 3 #4. Percent of Responses for Father's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Primary Occupation of Father	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Profession	92	17.6	87	19.3	5	7.0
Proprietor	81	15.5	66	14.6	15	21.1
Business official	90	17.2	79	17.5	11	15.5
Salesman	38	7.3	37	8.2	1	1.4
Clerical worker	18	3.4	15	3.3	3	4.2
Farm owner	56	10.7	44	9.8	12	16.9
Farm worker	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0
Technician	31	5.9	26	5.8	5	7.0
Skilled operator	55	10.5	51	11.3	4	5.6
Service worker	16	3.1	14	3.1	2	2.8
Laborer	18	3.4	12	2.7	6	8.5
Retired	3	0.6	3	0.7	0	0
Deceased	6	1.1	2	0.4	4	5.6
Other	16	3.1	13	2.9	3	4.2
Total	522	99.8	451	100.0	71	99.8

The findings presented in Table Q 3 # 4 indicated that

there were 6 fathers' occupations for which there was a difference of greater than 3 percentage points in the proportion of responses from graduates in the two program groups; generic program respondents reported a greater proportion of fathers were in the professions (12.3%), were salesmen (6.8%) and were skilled operators (5.7%); registered nurse program respondents reported a greater proportion of fathers were proprietors (6.5%), farm owners (7.1%) and laborers (5.8%);

the proportion of registered nurse program respondents who reported that their fathers were deceased was proportionately greater by 5.2%.

Question 5: "When you first entered the University of Tennessee nursing programs, was your mother, or mother substitute, gainfully employed? (Circle one)."

There were 528 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency, in Table Q 5 #1.

Table Q 5 #1. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents at Time of Admission to UTCN

Employed/Not Employed Status	Responses N	%
Not employed	283	53.6
Employed, full-time	213	40.3
*Employed, part-time	32	6.1
Total	528	100.0

---

*The term "part-time" employment used throughout this report means any employment that involves only a portion of a work week.

The number and percent of responses for mothers' employed/not employed status by Class, is presented in Table Q 5 #2.

Table Q 5 #2. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers at Time of Respondent's Admission to UTCN, by Class.

Class	Not Employed Responses		Part-time Employed Responses		Full-time Employed Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	12	52.2	0	0.0	11	47.8
1955	13	65.0	1	5.0	6	30.0
1956	18	54.5	4	12.1	11	33.3
1957	16	59.3	1	3.7	10	37.0
1958	24	68.6	1	2.9	10	28.6
1959	11	55.0	2	10.0	7	35.0
1960	14	70.0	0	0.0	6	30.0
1961	12	60.0	0	0.0	8	40.0
1962	12	54.5	2	9.1	8	36.4
1963	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
1964	11	55.0	1	5.0	8	40.0
1965	14	70.0	0	0.0	6	30.0
1966	18	64.3	0	0.0	10	35.7
1967	4	33.3	2	16.7	6	50.0
1968	15	40.5	1	2.7	21	56.8
1969	16	50.0	5	15.6	11	34.4
1970	19	51.4	0	0.0	18	48.6
1971	17	53.1	1	3.1	14	43.7
1972	10	45.5	1	4.5	11	50.0
1973	11	50.0	2	9.1	9	40.9
1974	16	41.0	6	15.4	17	43.9
Total	283	Av 53.6	32	Av 6.7	213	Av 40.3

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 5 between those made by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 5 #3.

Table Q 5 #3. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents by Decade Groupings of Classes.

Employed/Not Employed Status	Respondents in Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Not employed	143	57.9	140	49.8
Employed, full-time	90	36.4	123	43.8
Employed, part-time	14	5.7	18	6.4
Total	247	100.0	281	100.0

The findings presented in Tables Q 5 #2 and #3 indicated that

the proportion of mothers employed at the time their daughters enrolled at UTCN from 1961 to 1970 (Classes 1965 to 1974) was 8.0% higher than for the mothers of respondents who enrolled from 1950 to 1960 (Classes 1954 to 1964);

in the responses from only four Classes (1963, 1967, 1968 and 1974) was there evidence that the rate of employment among mothers reached the 58% estimated to be the national rate at the time of writing of this report.

A comparison was made between the employed/not employed status of mothers at the time of admission of respondents as reported in the UTCN study and the Vanderbilt[1] study.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 5 #4.

Table Q 5 #4. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Employed/Not Employed Status	Respondents in UTCN Study Responses		Respondents in Vanderbilt Study Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Not employed	283	53.6	525	73.4
*Employed, full-time and part-time	245	46.4	190	26.6
Total	528	100.0	715	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 5 #4 indicated that

as might be expected on the basis of the differences in fathers' occupations (and presumed incomes) previously referred to, the proportion of employed mothers is smaller in the Vanderbilt study.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 13

*No distinction is made between full-time and part-time employment in the Vanderbilt study.

A comparison was made of the information available about the rate of employment of mothers of respondents in the NLN,[1] Vanderbilt[2] and UTCN studies.

The responses in all three studies related to the time at which respondents had entered upon the study of nursing.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 5 #5.

Table Q 5 #5. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in NLN, UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Study	Year of Admission (Approximate)	Employed Mothers Responses		Not Employed Mothers Responses	
		N	%	N	%
NLN Baccalaureate Program N 13365	1962-1967	5370	40.2	7995	59.8
Vanderbilt Total N 715	1927-1960	190	26.6	525	73.4
UTCN Total N 528	1950-1971	245	46.4	283	53.6
UTCN Classes 1954-1964	1950-1961	104	42.1	143	57.9
UTCN Classes 1965-1974 N 281	1962-1971	141	50.2	140	49.8

The findings in Table Q 5 #5 indicated that

the proportion of employed mothers reported in the UTCN study was appreciably higher than that reported on the NLN study and that the difference was greatest when the time periods involved most closely approximated each other;

the period during which the rate of employment among mothers in the UTCN study increased most markedly was the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

---

[1] Knopf, L., From Student to RN. Table 30 p. 64

[2] Donaldson, M.L., p. 13

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to the options concerning mothers employment, by respondents who were graduates of the generic program and of the registered nurse program.

The findings are presented in Table Q 5 # 6.

Table Q 5 #6. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Employed/ Not Employed Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not employed	28.3	56.6	230	50.4	53	73.6
Employed part-time	32	6.1	29	6.4	3	4.2
Employed full-time	213	40.3	197	43.2	16	22.2
Total	528	100.0	456	100.0	72	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 5 #6 indicated that

despite the relatively small number of respondents from the registered nurse program, they reported a considerably smaller proportion of mothers who were employed when the respondent enrolled at UTCN than was the case for generic program respondents.

Question 6. "What was your mother's occupation when you first entered The University of Tennessee nursing programs? (Circle one)."

There were 248* usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 6 #1.

Table Q 6 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Mother

Primary Occupation of Mother	Responses N	%
Clerical worker (office, bookkeeper)	81	32.7%
Profession (teacher, registered nurse, doctor, dietitian)	77	31.0%
Service worker (waitress, beautician, cook, practical nurse)	23	9.3%
Saleswoman (wholesale or retail)	17	6.9%
Skilled operator or machine operator	16	6.5%
Proprietor (self-employed business woman, store owner)	15	6.0%
Business official or executive (buyer, supervisor, personnel director)	11	4.4%
Technician or semi-professional worker (lab technician)	5	2.0%
Other	3	1.2%
Total	248	100.0%

The three occupations specified as "other" were included in the listed occupations as follows; newspaper reporter was included in profession; baby sitter (full-time) and dental assistant were included in service worker.

---

*This is 3 more than the 245 responses to Question 5 that indicated that mothers were full-time or part-time employed. Setting aside the possibility of coding error, another explanation of the discrepency is that 3 respondents who either did not answer Question 5 or who answered "no", may have answered Question 6 by giving the occupation the mother had followed at one time, though not employed at the time the respondent entered the College of Nursing.

Information concerning the occupations of mothers of respondents in the Vanderbilt[1] study is limited to the statement that professional occupations ranked first, clerical occupations ranked second and proprietory occupations ranked third.

As was the case in relation to occupations of fathers, it is not possible to compare the data concerning occupations of mothers in the UTCN study and the NLN[2] study because of the lack of similarity of the categories used in the two studies.

The percent of responses for 4 categories of occupations of respondents' mothers at the time the respondent enrolled at UTCN, by Class, is presented in Table A 2 in the Appendix.

The percent of responses for 8 occupations of respondents' mothers, by 2 decade groupings of Classes, is presented in Table Q 6 #2.

Table Q 6 #2. Percent of Responses for 8 Occupations of Mothers by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

Occupation of Mother	Respondents in Classes 1954-1965 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Clerical work	29	27.6	52	36.4
Profession	36	34.3	42	29.4
Service worker	14	13.3	11	7.7
Saleswoman	6	5.7	11	7.7
Skilled operator	9	8.6	7	4.9
Proprietor	7	6.7	8	5.6
Business official	3	2.8	8	5.6
Technician	1	0.9	4	2.8
Total	105	99.9	143	100.1

The findings presented in Table Q 6 #2 indicated that

there were four occupations in which the difference in the proportion of responses for the two decade groups was greater than 3 percentage points; the proportion of mothers who were employed as clerical workers had increased by 8.8% in the second decade over the first while the proportion who were employed in professions, as service workers and skilled operators had decreased by 4.9%, 5.6% and 3.7% respectively.

The calculated Chi Square for independence for the 248 responses (organized into 4 categories) was 6.30. At the .05 level of significance for 3 degrees of freedom, the Chi Square critical value was 7.815. Therefore, the occupations of the respondents' mothers, at the time the respondent entered UTCN, were independent of the calendar year of the respondent's enrollment.

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 14

[2] Knopf, L., From Student to RN., Table 29 p. 64

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to the options concerning categories of employment of mothers by respondents who were graduates of the generic program and the registered nurse program.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 6 # 3.

Table Q 6 #3. Percent of Responses for Occupations of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Occupation of Mother	Total Population Response		Generic Program Response		Registered Nurse Program Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Profession	78	31.5	73	32.3	5	23.8
Proprietor	15	6.0	14	6.2	1	4.8
Business official	11	4.4	11	4.8	0	0
Saleswoman	17	6.9	16	7.0	1	4.8
Clerical worker	81	32.7	76	33.5	5	23.8
Technician	5	2.0	5	2.2	0	0
Skilled operator	16	6.5	14	6.2	2	9.5
Service worker	25	10.1	18	7.9	7	33.3
Total	248	100.1	227	100.0	21	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 6 #3 indicated that

there were five occupations in which the difference in the proportion of responses for the two program groups was greater than 3 percentage points; the proportion of mothers of generic program respondents was greater than that for mothers of registered nurse program respondents in the professions, and the categories of business officials and clerical workers by 8.4%, 4.8% and 9.7% respectively;

the proportion of mothers of registered nurse program respondents was greater in the occupations of skilled operator and service worker by 3.3% and 25.4% respectively.

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

Question 7. "What schooling did your parents complete? (Circle one for each.)" For fathers there were 523 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 7 #1.

Table Q 7 #1. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Father of Respondent.

Schooling Completed by Father	Responses N	%
High school graduate	120	22.9
Some high school, not a graduate	97	18.5
Some college, not a graduate	94	17.9
College graduate	69	13.2
Grade school	65	12.4
Post-graduate	55	10.5
Technical or vocational graduate (include RN)	23	4.4
Total	523	99.8

A comparison was made of the education completed by father as reported by respondents in the UTCN, Vanderbilt[1] and NLN[2] studies.

These findings are presnted in Table Q 7 #2.

Table Q 7 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers of Respondents in 3 Studies.

Schooling Completed by Father	UTCN Study Responses		Vanderbilt Study Responses		NLN Study Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school graduate or less	282	53.8	174	37.3	6756	51.5
Some college	117	22.3	93	20.0	2586	19.7
College degree or better	124	23.7	199	42.7	3772	28.8
Total	523	99.8	466	100.0	13,114	100.0

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. Figure 1 p. 12

[2] Knopf, L. From Student to RN. Table #23 p. 60

The findings presented in Table Q 7 #2 indicated that

fathers of respondents in the UTCN study ranked only slightly below fathers of respondents in the NLN study but considerably below fathers of respondents in the Vanderbilt study in the matter of education completed.

For mothers, there were 528 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 7 #3.

Table Q 7 #3. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Mother of Respondent.

Schooling Completed by Mother	Responses N	Responses %
High school graduate	148	28.0
Some college, not graduate	111	21.0
Some high school, not graduate	78	14.8
Technical or vocational graduate (include RN)	76	14.4
College graduate	52	9.8
Grade school	42	8.0
Post-graduate	21	4.0
Total	528	100.0

A comparison was made of the education completed by mothers as reported by respondents in the UTCN, Vanderbilt[1] and NLN[2] studies.

The findings are presented in Table Q 7 #4.

Table Q 7#4. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in 3 Studies.

Education Completed by Mother	NLN Study Responses		UTCN Study Responses		Vanderbilt Study Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school graduate or less	7292	55.1	268	50.8	194	41.6
Some college	3809	28.8	187	35.4	152	32.6
College degree or better	2145	16.2	73	13.8	120	25.8
Total	13246	100.1	528	100.0	466	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 7 #4 indicated that

mothers of the UTCN study respondents ranked slightly better than the mothers of respondents in the NLN study in the matter of a smaller proportion having completed only high school and a large proportion having completed some college; however, they ranked slightly less well than the mothers of respondents in the NLN study in the matter of graduation from college and graduate study;

the mothers of the UTCN study respondents ranked relatively equally with the mothers of the Vanderbilt study respondents in the matter of having completed high school; however, they ranked considerably less well than mothers of the Vanderbilt study respondents in the matter of a higher proportion of them having completed only high school and a lower proportion of them having completed college and done graduate work.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. Figure 1 p. 12

[2] Knopf, L. From Student to RN. Table 31 p. 65

The number and percent of responses for 4 categories of education completed by fathers and mothers of respondents for the total population and by 2 decade groupings of Classes is presented in Table Q 7 #5.

Table Q 7 #5. Percent of Responses for 4 Levels of Education Completed by Total Population of Fathers and Mothers of Respondents' and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

FATHERS						
Schooling Completed	Total Responses		Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school and some high school	162	31.0	100	41.0	62	22.2
High school graduate	120	22.9	50	20.5	70	25.1
Some college inc. technicial and vocational graduates (RN)	117	22.4	53	21.7	64	22.9
College graduate and post-graduate	124	23.7	41	16.8	83	29.7
Total	523	100.0	244	100.0	279	99.9

Table Q 7 #5. Percent of Responses for 4 Levels of Education Completed by Total Population of Fathers and Mothers of Respondents' and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

MOTHERS						
Schooling Completed	Total Responses		Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school and some high school	120	22.7	71	29.0	49	17.3
High school graduate	148	28.0	72	29.4	76	26.9
Some college inc. technicial and vocational graduates (RN)	187	35.4	74	30.2	113	39.9
College graduate and post-graduate	73	13.8	28	11.4	45	15.9
Total	528	99.9	245	100.0	283	100.0

The calculated Chi Square for independence for the 523 responses (education completed by fathers) was 25.64; for the 528 responses (education completed by mothers) it was 17.61. At the .05 level of significance for three degrees of freedom, the Chi Square critical value was 7.815. Therefore, the level of education completed by each parent was not independent of the year of the respondent's enrollment.

The findings presented in Table Q 7 #5 indicated that

the proportion of fathers with the least and the most education exceeded the proportion of mothers in the same two categories, that is, a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had less than high school graduation but a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had graduated from college and done post graduate work;

the proportion of mothers with the intermediate levels of education, however, exceeded the proportion of fathers, that is, a greater proportion of mothers than fathers were high school graduates and were vocational and technical graduates, (including R.N.);

the greatest difference in the proportions between the parents' educational levels was found among those who had some college but had not graduated, mothers exceeding fathers by 13 percentage points; next in descending order was the difference among those holding college degrees, fathers exceeding mothers by 9.9 percentage points; next was the difference between those who had not graduated from high school, the fathers exceeding the mothers by 8.3 percentage points; finally, the smallest difference was among those who were high school graduates, the mothers exceeding the fathers by 5.1 percentage points.

The increments of change in the levels of education completed by fathers from the first to the second decade of the study, in descending order of magnitude, were as follows:

18.8% decrease in the proportion of fathers with less than high school graduation,
12.9% increase in proportion of fathers with college degree and above,
4.6% increase in proportion of fathers with high school graduation
1.2% increase in proportion of fathers with some college and technical or vocational graduation (including R.N.).

The increments of change in the levels of education completed by mothers from the first to the second decade of the study, in descending order of magnitude, were as follows:

11.7% decrease in the proportion of mothers with less than high school graduation,
9.7% increase in proportion of mothers with some college and with technical or vocational graduation (including R.N.),
4.5% increase in proportion of mothers with college degree and above,
2.5% decrease in proportion of mothers with high school graduation.

A common base for comparing responses to Question 7 was developed by assigning a value of from 1 to 7 points to the levels of completed education. The grade school level was assigned a value of 1 point, some high school, not graduate, was assigned a value of 2 points and so on up to post graduate which was assigned a value of 7 points.

The levels of completed education for respondents' fathers and mothers are presented in terms of point values and by 2 decade groupings of Classes in Table A 3 Appendix.

The average point values were as follows:

	Fathers			Mothers	
	N	Average		N	Average
Total	523	3.79	Total	528	3.71
Classes			Classes		
1954-1964	244	3.37	1954-1964	245	3.48
1965-1974	279	4.15	1965-1974	283	3.91

These findings indicated that

there was little difference on the basis of average point values between the levels of education completed by the mothers and the fathers of respondents in the total population;

the level of education completed by the fathers, however, began at a lower level and ended at a higher level than was the case for the mothers;

with the exception of Classes 1955 and 1960, the mothers completed a higher level of education, by Class average, than had the fathers up to and including Class 1962; beginning with Class 1963 and excepting Classes 1966 and 1974, the fathers had completed a higher level of education, by Class average than had the mothers.

A comparison was made of the levels of education completed by respondents' fathers, by respondents' UTCN program. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 7 #6.

Table Q 7 #6. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Fathers, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Schooling Completed by Father	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school	65	12.4	49	10.9	16	21.6
Some high school not graduate	97	18.5	79	17.6	18	24.3
High school graduate	120	22.9	103	22.9	17	23.0
Technical/vocational graduate	23	4.4	20	4.5	3	4.0
Some college, not graduate	94	17.9	81	18.0	13	17.6
College graduate	69	13.2	65	14.5	4	5.4
Post-graduate	55	10.5	52	11.6	3	4.0
Total	523	99.8	449	100.0	74	99.9

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses for levels of education completed by mothers, by respondents' UTCN Program.

These findings are presented in Table Q 7 #7.

Table Q 7 #7. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Schooling Completed by Mother	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school	42	8.0	29	6.4	13	17.3
Some high school, not graduate	78	14.8	57	12.6	21	28.0
High school graduate	148	28.0	132	29.1	16	21.3
Technical/vocational graduate	76	14.4	73	16.1	3	4.0
Some college, not graduate	111	21.0	96	21.2	15	20.0
College graduate	52	9.8	48	10.6	4	5.3
Post-graduate	21	4.0	18	4.0	3	4.0
Total	528	100.0	453	100.0	75	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 7 #6 and #7 indicated that

the proportion of fathers that had completed high school, had graduated from technical or vocational school and had had some college, was practically identical for respondents in both the generic and registered nurse program groups; for the generic program group, the proportion of fathers who had not completed high school was smaller and the proportion who had graduated from college was greater than was the case for the registered nurse program respondents;

the proportion of mothers that had some college but were not graduates and that had done post graduate study was similar for respondents in both program groups; for the generic program group, the proportion of mothers that had achieved less than high school graduation was smaller than it was for the registered nurse program respondents, while the proportion of them that had graduated from high school, technical or vocational school and college was greater than for the registered nurse program respondents.

Question 4. "Did your mother receive any education in nursing? (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 4 #1.

Table Q 4 #1. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	Responses N	%
No.	467	87.9%
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	37	7.0%
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	25	4.7%
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	2	0.4%
Total	531	100.0

A comparison was made between the type of education in nursing that was completed by mothers as reported in the UTCN study and the Vanderbilt[1] study.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 4 # 2.

Table Q 4 #2. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	UTCN Responses N	%	Vanderbilt Responses N	%
No.	467	87.9	643	89.9
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	37	7.0	46	6.4
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	25	4.7	20	2.8
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	2	0.4	6	0.8
Total	531	100.0	715	99.9

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 14

In the NLN[2] Career Pattern Study it is reported that between 6.8 and 8.7% of the baccalaureate students who participated stated that their mothers were registered nurses. The findings for both the UTCN and the Vanderbilt studies fall in the lower end of the range for the national sample. No further breakdown on types of nursing education of mothers is reported in the NLN study.

The number and percent of mothers who were registered nurses, including those holding the B.S.N. is presented, by Class in Table Q 4 #3.

Table Q 4 #3. Percent of Mothers who were Registered Nurses, by Class.

Class	Respondents	Registered Nurse Mothers	
	N	N	%
1954	23	0	0.0
1955	20	0	0.0
1956	33	3	9.1
1957	27	2	7.4
1958	35	1	2.9
1959	20	2	10.0
1960	20	0	0.0
1961	21	1	4.8
1962	22	1	4.5
1963	7	2	28.6
1964	20	2	10.0
1965	20	1	5.0
1966	27	4	14.8
1967	12	1	8.3
1968	37	4	10.8
1969	32	4	12.5
1970	37	3	8.1
1971	32	3*	9.4
1972	22	1	4.5
1973	24	2*	8.3
1974	40	2	5.0
Total	531	39	Av 7.3

---

[2] Knopf, L., From Student to RN p. 12

*Includes one with B.S.N.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 4 recorded by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and respondents who graduated in 1965 and after.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 4 #4

Table Q 4 #4. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Respondents' Mothers, by Two Groupings of Classes.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	Respondents in Classes 1954-1964 Responses N	%	Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses N	%
No.	221	89.1	246	86.9
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	14	5.6	23	8.1
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	13	5.2	12	4.2
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	0	0	2	0.7
Total	248	99.9	283	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 4 #3 and #4 indicated that

there was a trend toward more respondents having a registered nurse mother in the Classes that graduated in 1965 and thereafter than was the case in Classes that graduated in 1964 and before.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses concerning mother's education in nursing recorded by respondents who were graduates of the generic program and the registered nurse program.

The findings are presented in Table Q 4 # 5.

Table Q 4 #5. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No.	467	87.9	398	87.5	69	90.8
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	25	4.7	20	4.4	5	6.6
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	37	7.0	35	7.7	2	2.6
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0
Total	531	100.0	455	100.0	76	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 4 #5 indicated that

a difference of more than 3 percentage points between the proportion of responses by the two program groups existed in only one category of responses, namely 5.1 percent more generic program respondents than registered nurse program respondents had mothers who qualified as registered nurses but did not hold the BSN.

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER AND NUMBER

Question 8. "Indicate the statement that best describes you in relation to your siblings. Count all siblings that lived past infancy. (Circle One)."

There were 529 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 8 #1.

Table Q 8 #1. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options.

Respondent's Sibling Birth Order	Responses N	%
The oldest child	196	37.1
None of these	135	25.5
The youngest child	133	25.1
The only child	65	12.3
Total	529	100.0

Data reported in the NLN[1] study on the birth order of siblings of respondents are presented in Table Q 8 #2.

Table Q 8 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Siblings Birth Order Options by Baccalaureate Program Respondents in NLN Study.

Respondent's Sibling Birth Order	Responses N	%
The only child	1101	8.3
The oldest child	5291	40.0
The youngest child	2918	22.1
None of these	3901	29.5
Total	13211	99.9

No data on sibling birth order of respondents are reported in the Vanderbilt study.

A comparison was made of the sibling birth order of the respondents from the generic program and the registered nurse program. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 8 #3.

Table Q 8 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Respondent's Birth Order	Total Population N	%	Generic Program N	%	Registered Nurse Program N	%
The only child	65	12.3	58	12.7	7	9.5
The oldest child	196	37.1	180	39.6	16	21.6
The youngest child	133	25.1	113	24.8	20	27.0
None of these	135	25.5	104	22.9	31	41.9
Total	529	100.0	455	100.0	74	100.0

---

[1] Knopf, L., From Student to RN Table 10 p. 51

49

The findings presented in Tables Q 8 #2 and #3 indicated that

the oldest child option accounted for the largest proportion of responses from generic program respondents in the UTCN study and from baccalaureate program respondents in the NLN study;

the only child option accounted for the smallest proportion among respondents in all three program groups;

the youngest child and the "none of these" options accounted for equal proportions of responses among UTCN generic program respondents;

among NLN respondents and registered nurse program respondents in the UTCN study, the proportion of the "none of these" responses was greater than the youngest child responses; in fact among registered nurse program respondents in the UTCN study "none of these" accounted for the greatest proportion of responses.

Question 9. "How many living siblings did you have when you enrolled in the University of Tennessee nursing program? (Circle one)."

There were 529 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 9 #1.

Table Q 9 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings.

Number of Living Siblings at Time Respondent Entered UTCN	Responses N	%
One	174	32.9
Two	127	24.0
None	73	13.8
Three	71	13.4
Four	37	7.0
Five	29	5.5
Six	8	1.5
Eight or more	6	1.1
Seven	4	0.8
Total	529	100.0

Although the NLN study requested information about number of siblings, no tabulation of the responses was included in the report of findings. The Vanderbilt study did not request the information.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 9 between those recorded by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after.

The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 9 #2

Table Q 9 #2. Percent of Responses for Living Siblings by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

Number of living sibling at time respondent entered in UTCN	Respondents in Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
None	35	14.2	38	13.4
One	79	32.1	95	33.6
Two	49	19.9	78	27.6
Three	28	11.4	43	15.2
Four	24	9.8	13	4.6
Five	18	7.3	11	3.9
Six	7	2.8	1	0.4
Seven	3	1.2	1	0.4
Eight or more	3	1.2	3	1.1
Total	246	99.9	283	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 9 #2 indicated that

there were four categories of number of siblings in which the difference in the proportion of responses for the two decade groupings was greater than 3.0 percentage points; the proportion of respondents who had two and three siblings was greater among those who graduated 1965–1974 than for those who graduated 1954–1964 by 7.7% and 3.8% respectively; the proportion of respondents who had four and five living siblings was greater among those who graduated in 1954–64 than for those who graduated 1965–74 by 5.2% and 3.4% respectively.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 9 by respondents who graduated from the generic program and from the registered nurse program.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 9 #3.

Table Q 9 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Living Siblings at Time of Respondents' Admission	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	73	13.8	65	14.3	8	10.8
One	174	32.9	163	35.8	11	14.9
Two	127	24.0	109	24.0	18	24.3
Three	71	13.4	58	12.7	13	17.6
Four	37	7.0	28	6.2	9	12.2
Five	29	5.5	19	4.2	10	13.5
Six	8	1.5	5	1.1	3	4.1
Seven	4	0.8	3	0.7	1	1.4
Eight or more	6	1.1	5	1.1	1	1.4
Total	529	100.0	455	100.1	74	100.2

The findings presented in Table Q 9 #3 indicated that

there were five categories of number of siblings in which the differences in proportion of responses for the two program groups was greater than 3.0 percentage points; the proportion of respondents who had no siblings and one sibling was greater among generic program respondents than among registered nurse program respondents by 3.5% and 20.9% respectively; the proportion of respondents who had three, four and five siblings was greater among registered nurse program respondents than among generic program respondents by 4.9%, 6% and 9.3% respectively.

FINANCIAL AID
FOR UTCN PROGRAM

Question 2. "Did you receive financial aid while attending The University of Tennessee School/College of Nursing? Exclude financial support from your family. (Circle the one providing the most aid)"

There were 496 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 2 #1.

Table Q 2 #1. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid.

Did you Receive Financial Aid?	Responses N	%
No. I did not receive financial aid.	246	49.5
Yes, from sources available through The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.	123	24.8
Yes, from sources with which I negotiated	69	13.9
Yes, from part-time employment.	58	11.7
Total	496	99.9

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to Question 2, by respondents who graduated from the generic program and from the registered nurse program.

The findings are presented in Table Q 2 #2.

Table Q 2 # 2. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial and by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Financial Assistance while attending College of Nursing	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
The College of Nursing Sources	123	24.8	77	17.8	46	71.9
Sources with which I negotiated	69	13.9	63	14.6	6	9.4
Part-time employment	58	11.7	56	13.0	2	3.1
No financial assistance received	246	49.6	236	54.6	10	15.6
Total	496	100.0	432	100.0	64	100.0

Traineeships funded by the Professional Nurse Traineeship Program and its predecessors were available to students in the registered nurse program throughout the period covered by the study. The noticably higher rate of use of financial aid available through UTCN among these respondents was largely attributable to the availability of the Professional Nurse Traineeships.

The percent of responses from generic program respondents for sources of financial aid, by Class, is presented in Table A 4 in the Appendix.

National Defense Student Loans became available to students through UTCN after 1959. Loans and scholarships funded by the Nurse Training Act of 1964 became available to students through UTCN after 1965.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of generic program respondents who did and did not receive financial assistance from UTCN, from other sources, and from part–time employment, in three groups of Classes designated on the basis of the availability of federal funds.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 2 #3.

Table Q 2 #3. Percent of Generic Program Respondents Who Received/Did Not Receive Aid by 3 Class Groupings Based on Availability of Federal Funds.

Generic Program	Federal Funds Available					
	Classes 1954-1959 None		Classes 1960-1965 N.D.S.L.		Classes 1966-1974 N.D.S.L. and N.T.A.L. & S.	
	Respondents		Respondents		Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received UTCN aid	3	2.3	7	7.9	67	31.9
Received other aid	9	6.8	24	26.9	30	14.3
Part-time employed	16	12.0	16	18.0	24	11.4
Recieved no aid	105	78.9	42	47.2	89	42.4
Total	133	100.0	89	100.0	210	100.0

It was beyond the scope of this study to determine how the cost of the program at UTCN may have influenced the findings presented in Table Q 2 #3. The findings, considered as they stand, indicated that

before federal loan funds became available to UTCN students, part–time employment was the source of financial assistance used by more students than was the case for all other sources, UTCN included;

as financial assistance became available through the National Defense Student Loan program and the Nurse Training Act program, the proportion of generic program respondents that used UTCN as a source of financial assistance increased and the proportion that sought financial assistance from other sources, including part–time employment, decreased from their peaks in the early 1960s.

Chapter 2

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

The personal history of the respondents since graduation from The University of Tennessee College of Nursing was the next subject addressed in this study.

REGION OF RESIDENCE SINCE GRADUATION

Question 47. "Where have you lived for most of the time since leaving the University of Tennessee program(s)? (Circle one area and underline the state)."

There were 515 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 47 #1.

Table Q 47 #1. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation.

Regions of the United States and Foreign Country	Responses N	%
East South Central (Ala., Ky., Miss., Tenn.)	354	68.7
South Atlantic (Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., W.Va.)	51	9.9
West South Central (Ark., La., Okla., Texas)	31	6.0
Pacific (Alaska, Calif., Hawaii, Ore., Wash.)	29	5.6
Mountain (Ariz., Colo., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Utah, Wyo.)	13	2.5
Foreign Country	11	2.3
East North Central (Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wis.)	10	1.9
West North Central (Iowa, Kan., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., S.D.)	7	1.4
Middle Atlantic (N.J., N.Y., Penn.)	6	1.2
New England (Conn., Maine, Mass., N. Hamp., Vermont, R.I.)	3	0.6
Total	515	100.1

A comparison of responses was made on the basis of two graduation–response intervals. The findings are presented in Table Q 47 #2.

Table Q 47 #2. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Regions of U.S. and	Graduation–Response 3–13 years Responses N	%	Intervals 2 years Responses N	%
New England	0	0.0	3	1.1
Middle Atlantic	5	2.1	1	0.4
South Atlantic	32	13.3	19	6.9
East South Central	151	62.9	203	73.8
West South Central	15	6.3	16	5.8
East North Central	6	2.5	4	1.5
West North Central	5	2.1	2	0.7
Mountain	3	1.3	10	3.6
Pacific	16	6.7	13	4.7
Foreign Country	7	2.9	4	1.5
Total	240	100.1	275	100.0%

A comparison was made of the findings from the response to four questions on Q One and Q Two, all of which related to the geographic distribution of respondents.

Responses to Question 1, Q One recorded the geographic region in which the respondent had lived, primarily, before entering The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

Responses to Question 47, Q One recorded the geographic region in which the respondent lived most of the time after graduation from The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

Responses to Question 14, Q One recorded all the geographic regions in which the respondent had worked as a nurse, full–time or part–time, for one year or more, since graduation from The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

Responses to Question 4, Q Two recorded all the geographic regions in which the respondent had been employed as a nurse, full–time or part–time, for one year or more, in the five year period since answering Q One.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 47 #3.

Table Q 47 #3. Percent of Responses for Region of Origin, Residence after Graduation and Employment, Q One and Q Two.

Regions of United States and Foreign Country	Region of Origins N=526 %	Region of Residence after Grad. N=515 %	Regions of Employment *Q One N=622 %	Regions of Employment ** Q Two N=231 %
New England	0.0	0.6	0.9	1.7
Middle Atlantic	1.7	1.2	2.0	3.0
South Atlantic	4.4	9.9	9.4	13.9
East South Central	79.5	68.7	64.5	53.7
West South Central	6.8	6.0	6.6	10.0
East North Central	2.8	1.9	2.6	2.2
West North Central	2.8	1.4	1.7	2.2
Mountain	0.0	2.5	3.5	3.0
Pacific	0.4	5.6	6.2	6.9
Foreign Country	1.5	2.1	2.7	3.5
Total	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.1

*Answered 1967 through 1976
**Answered 1972 through 1976

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for each region by graduates of the generic program and the registered nurse program. The findings are presented in Table Q 47 #4.

Table Q 47 #4. Percent of Responses for Regions of U.S. and Foreign Country of Residence Since Graduation by Respondents' UTCN Program

Regions of US and Foreign Country	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	3	0.6	3	0.7	0	0
Middle Atlantic	6	1.2	6	1.4	0	0
South Atlantic	51	9.9	47	10.6	4	5.5
East South Central	354	68.7	292	66.1	62	85.0
West South Central	31	6.0	29	6.6	2	2.7
East North Central	10	1.9	10	2.3	0	0
West North Central	7	1.4	7	1.6	0	0
Mountain	13	2.5	12	2.7	1	1.4
Pacific	29	5.6	26	5.9	3	4.1
Foreign Country	11	2.3	10	2.3	1	1.4
Total	515	100.1	442	100.2	73	100.1

The findings presented concerning regions of residence and employment since graduation provided evidence for the following conclusions:

while 90.7% of all respondents came from the three contiguous regions, the South Atlantic and the East and West South Central regions, (Table Q 47 #3) the percent of respondents replying 2 years after graduation who recorded living most of that time in the three contiguous regions was 86.5% and the percent of respondents replying similarly 3–13 years after graduation had only dropped to 82.5% (Table Q 47 #2); thus it seemed clear that "the South" retained the vast majority of its UTCN graduates, as residents, during the period of this study;

registered nurse program respondents displayed an even higher degree of regional stability (93.2%) than did the generic program respondents (83.3%) (Table Q 47 #4);

"the South" was relatively less successful in retaining respondents in employment in nursing than it was in retaining them as residents, 80.5% on Q One and 77.6% on Q Two (Table Q 47 #3);

respondents who stayed in the East South Central region, in full and part–time employment in nursing, had approximately the same rate of employment as did the total population; on Q one their responses were 64.5% of all responses indicating full and part–time employment in nursing (Table Q 47 #3) while the rate for full and part–time employment for the total population was 62.9% (Table Q 12 #1, Volume 1); on Q Two their responses were 53.7% of those recorded for all regions while the rate of employment for the total population was 53.3% (Table Q 12 #5, Volume 1);

responses that indicated employment outside the East South Central region were concentrated in the two contiguous regions and the percent of these responses rose from 16% on Q One to 23.9% on Q Two; the only other region approximately even the lowest response rate for any portion of "the South" was the Pacific region.

MARITAL STATUS

Question 49. "What is your present marital status? (Circle one)."

There were 530 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 49 #1.

Table Q 49 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options

Marital Status	Responses	
	N	%
Widowed	6	1.1
Divorced	14	2.6
Separated	2	0.4
Married	395	74.5
Never married	113	21.3
Total	530	99.9

A comparison was made of the responses recorded by persons who answered Questionnaire One from 3–13 years after graduation and by those who answered 2 years after graduation. The findings are presented in Table Q 49 #2.

Table Q 49 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Two Graduation–Response Intervals.

Graduation–Response Interval in years	Marital Status									
	Widowed		Divorced		Separated		Married		Never Married	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3–13 N = 247	5	2.0	10	4.0	1	0.4	195	78.9	36	14.6
2 N = 283	1	0.4	4	1.4	1	0.4	200	70.7	77	27.2

The divorce rate for the 417 ever–married respondents was 3.36%; for respondents answering 2 years after graduation it was 1.9%; for those answering from 3–13 years after graduation it was 4.7%.

The distribution of the 530 responses for marital status, by Class, is presented in Table Q 49 #3.

Table Q 49 #3. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Class.

Class	Grad. Resp. Interv. Years	Respondents	Marital Status				
		N	Widowed %	Divorced %	Separated %	Married %	Never Married %
1954	13	23	0.0	4.3	0.0	82.6	13.0
1955	12	20	5.0	5.0	0.0	85.0	5.0
1956	11	33	0.0	9.1	0.0	87.9	3.0
1957	10	27	3.7	7.4	0.0	77.8	11.1
1958	9	34	5.9	0.0	2.9	82.4	8.8
1959	8	20	5.0	5.0	0.0	75.0	15.0
1960	7	20	0.0	5.0	0.0	90.0	5.0
1961	6	21	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	14.3
1962	5	22	0.0	4.5	0.0	63.6	31.8
1963	4	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9
1964	3	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
1965	2	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0
1966	2	28	0.0	3.6	0.0	60.7	35.7
1967	2	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0
1968	2	37	0.0	0.0	0.0	78.4	21.6
1969	2	31	0.0	3.2	3.2	80.6	12.9
1970	2	36	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.4	30.6
1971	2	32	0.0	3.1	0.0	65.6	31.2
1972	2	22	0.0	4.5	0.0	81.8	13.6
1973	2	24	1.2	0.0	0.0	66.7	29.2
1974	2	41	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.0	39.0
Total		530	AV 1.1	2.6	0.4	74.5	21.3

A comparison was made between the number and percent of responses for each marital status option for generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 49 #4.

Table Q 49 #4. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Marital Status	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Married	395	74.5	352	77.5	43	56.6
Never Married	113	21.3	89	19.6	24	31.6
Divorced	14	2.6	9	2.0	5	6.6
Widowed	6	1.1	2	0.4	4	5.3
Separated	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0.0
Total	530	99.9	454	99.9	76	100.1

The findings presented in Table Q 49 #4 indicated that

respondents in the registered nurse program group reported 20% fewer being married, 12% more being never married, three times as many being divorced and five times as many being widowed as was the case for generic program respondents;

the divorce rates for the ever married respondents were 9.6% for the registered nurse program respondents and 2.5% for the generic program respondents.

Questions 21 and 22 on Q Two requested information about changes in marital status since Question 49 was answered on Q One.

Question 21. "Has your marital status changed since you answered the previous questionnaire?"

There were 248 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 49 #5.

Table Q 49 #5. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status Q Two.

Change in Marital Status	Responses N	Responses %
No	214	86.3
Yes	34	13.7
Total	248	100.0

The 34 responses that indicated a change in marital status were distributed among the 5 marital status options in Question 22 Q Two as presented in Table Q 49 #6.

Table Q 49 #6. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status, Q Two.

Marital Status as Result of Change	Responses N	Responses %
Married	18	52.9
Separated	0	0.0
Divorced	9	26.5
Remarried	5	14.7
Widowed	2	5.9
Total	34	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to Question 21 Q Two by generic program and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 49 #7.

Table Q 49 #7. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status on Q Two by Respondents' UTCN Program

Marital Status	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Has changed	34	13.7	28	12.8	6	20.7
No change	214	86.3	191	87.2	23	79.3
Total	248	100.0	219	100.0	29	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to Question 22 Q Two by respondents of the generic program and the registered nurse program. These findings are presented in Table Q 49 #8.

Table Q 49 #8. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change of Marital Status on Q Two by Respondents' UTCN Program

Marital Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married	18	52.9	15	53.6	3	50.0
Separated	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Divorced	9	26.5	7	25.0	2	33.3
Remarried	5	14.7	5	17.9	0	0
Widowed	2	5.9	1	3.6	1	16.7
Total	34	100.0	28	100.1	6	100.0

Based on the combined data on marital status from Q One and Q Two it was evident that

the 23 respondents who recorded having been divorced constituted 5.3% of the 435 respondents who recorded ever having been married; this compares with the estimated national divorce rate of 20% for women of similar age distribution; respondents in this study obviously maintained more stable marital relationships than the total U.S. population of the same sex and age groupings.

The number and percent of responses from the 93 respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample (Table Q 10 #16, Volume 1, p 39) to Question 49 Q One are presented in Table Q 49 #9.

Table Q 49 #9. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Marital Status Options

Marital Status	Responses N	Responses %
Widowed	0	0.0
Divorced	2	2.2
Separated	1	1.1
Married	65	69.9
Never married	25	26.9
Total	93	100.1

The number and percent of responses from the Two Year–Seven Year Sample to Question 21 Q Two are presented in Table Q 49 #10.

Table Q 49 #10. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Change in Marital Status Q Two

Change in Marital Status	Responses N	Responses %
No	71	76.3
Yes	22	23.7
Total	93	100.0

The 22 responses that indicated a change in marital status were distributed among the 5 marital status options in Question 22 Q Two as presented in Table Q 49 #11.

Table Q 49 #11. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two

Marital Status as Result of Change	Responses N	Responses %
Married	14	63.6
Separated	0	0.0
Divorced	5	22.7
Remarried	3	13.6
Widowed	0	0.0
Total	22	99.9

Respondents in this Sample answered Q Two seven years after graduation, whereas the interval since graduation for the total population ranged from seven to eighteen years. This may have bearing on the finding that the percent of responses for a change in marital status and for the change being to married status is considerably greater in the Sample than in the total population.

A comparison was made of the marital status of the respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample and the baccalaureate graduates in the NLN[1] study. Data for this comparison were derived from Table 1 in the report of the NLN study and the categories of marital status used in it were used in the comparison; this meant grouping the responses for widowed, divorced and separated in the UTCN Sample under the one category of formerly married. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 49 #12.

Table 49 #12. Percent of Responses from Selected UTCN and NLN Respondents for 3 Categories of Marital Status by 2 Graduation–Response Interval Groups

Marital Status	NLN G–R Interval 1 year Responses		UTCN G–R Interval 2 years Responses		NLN G–R Interval 5 years Responses		UTCN* G–R Interval 7 years Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	852	49.6	25	26.9	311	19.0	11	11.8
Married	846	49.3	65	69.9	1274	78.0	77	82.8
Formerly Married	19	1.1	3	3.2	49	3.0	5	5.4
Total	1717	100.0	13	100.0	1634	100.0	93	100.0

Admittedly, the two samples are not comparable in size and the graduation–response intervals are not identical; however, the trends are similar in the two samples, namely, the proportion of respondents who remained single decreased with time and the proportion who married increased with time;

the category of formerly married is not identical to the category of divorced but it was permissable to assume that it closely resembled it for purposes of calculating the divorce rate of the two samples; the percent of the formerly and currently married who were formerly married (divorced) for each sample and each graduation–response interval was: NLN at 1 year, 2.2%; UTCN at 2 years, 2.9%; NLN at 5 years, 3.7%; UTCN at 7 years, 6.1%; as would be expected, this again, indicated an increase in the divorce rate with the passage of time.

*This distribution of the 93 respondents was derived from responses to Question 49 Q One and Questions 21 and 22 Q Two in the following manner: of the 65 respondents who were married on Q One, 5 had been divorced in the interval between questionnaires, leaving 60 still married; of the 3 persons who were divorced or separated on Q One, all had remarried on Q Two; of the 25 respondents who were single on Q One, 14 had married on Q Two, leaving 11 persons in the single category on Q Two; the married category now had 14 newly married, 3 remarried and 60 still married, a total of 77. No respondents reported being widowed or separated so the formerly married category contains only the 5 respondents who reported a change in marital status to divorced since answering Q One.

[1] Knopf, L., RN's One and Five Years After Graduation, Table 1 p. 5

The overall findings for Question 49 Q One and Questions 21 and 22 Q Two were considered in light of the following;

the 248 respondents who reported on their marital status as changed or unchanged on Q Two, constituted only 46.8% of the group that reported on their marital status originally on Q One;

the graduation–response intervals for Q Two respondents ranged from 7 to 18 years whereas they ranged from 2 to 13 years for Q One respondents;

the N of respondents who reported on a change of marital status was relatively small and it excluded the Classes 1970–1974 which constituted 29.2% of the Q One respondents;

respondents in Classes 1970–1974, furthermore, were in the graduation–response intervals of 2 to 7 years, when change from unmarried to married status is higher than it is for the 7 to 18 year group.

The only data, therefore, that provide the basis for a path study are those for respondents in Classes 1954–1965 who answered the two questionnaires from 2 to 13 years and from 7 to 18 years after graduation, respectively, and the respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample who all answered 2 and 7 years after graduation.

The findings for these selected groups gave rise to the observations that

a majority of all respondents and all subgroups were or had formerly been married;

the marriage rate was highest among generic program respondents more than two years out of school and lowest among registered nurse program respondents;

the divorce rate among those who had ever been married was lowest among generic program respondents two years after graduation and highest among registered nurse program respondents.

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

Question 51. "When did you first marry? (Circle one)."

There were 419 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 51 #1.

Table Q 51 #1. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage.

Time of First Marriage	Responses N	%
Married before first enrollment in UT nursing program(s)	33	7.9
Married before senior year of first enrollment	75	17.9
Married during senior year of first enrollment	57	13.6
Married within one year of first graduation from the nursing program(s)	147	35.1
Married between one and three years after first graduation	77	18.4
Married more than three years after first graduation	30	7.2
Total	419	100.1%

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses recorded for each of the six time options for first marriage by generic and registered nurse program respondents. These findings are presented in Table Q 51 #2.

Table Q 51 #2. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Time of First Marriage	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Before first enrollment	33	7.9	11	3.0	22	42.3
Before senior year	75	17.9	71	19.3	4	7.7
During senior year	57	13.6	54	14.7	3	5.8
Within one year after graduation	147	35.1	134	36.5	13	25.0
Between one and three years after graduation	77	18.4	69	18.8	8	15.4
More than three years after graduation	30	7.2	28	7.6	2	3.8
Total	419	100.1	367	99.9	52	100.0

The percent of responses for the six options for time of first marriage, by respondents' UTCN program and by Class is presented in Table A 4, Appendix.

The findings presented in Table A 4 indicated that

respondents in the registered nurse program group had a markedly higher rate of marriage prior to enrollment in the College and a lower rate of marriage during enrollment than did the respondents in the generic program group; this was understandable on the basis of the differences in ages of the respondents in the two program groups (Table Q 48 #2);

a slightly higher proportion of generic program respondents married in the first year after graduation but the rates were relatively equal for the two groups for the period from one to three years after graduation;

marriage before enrollment was identified by registered nurse program respondents throughout the twenty–one years covered by the study but it did not appear among the generic program respondents prior to the Classes that enrolled in the early 1960's;

marriage during enrollment, prior to and during the senior year, accounted for only 7 of the 52 responses from members of the registered nurse program group (13.5%) while it accounted for 125 out of the 367 responses from members of the generic program group (34.1%)

the generic program respondents who were members of the Classes 1954 to 1963, of whom none was married prior to enrollment, numbered 174 or 47.7% of the generic program respondents to Question 51; of these, 65 or 37.4% were married while they were enrolled in UTCN;

the generic program respondents who were members of the Classes 1964 to 1974, of whom 11 were married prior to enrollment, numbered 193 or 52.6% of the generic program respondents to Question 51; of the 182 respondents in these Classes who were not married at the beginning of their enrollment, 60 or 33.0% were married while they were enrolled in UTCN.

An analysis of the responses to Question 51 was made to determine possible trends toward earlier or later marriage among generic program respondents. Since the sixth time option, marriage more than three years after first graduation, did not apply to all respondents, it was omitted from the analysis. Values of 1 through 5 points were assigned to the first five options, respectively, to establish a basis for comparing the responses, by Class. The finding of this analysis of the responses of generic program respondents to options 1–5 on Question 51 are presented in Table Q 51 #3.

Table Q 51 #3. Responses of Generic Program Respondents for Five Options for Time of First Marriage Using Point System, by Class

Class	Responses N	Average Points	Class	Responses N	Average Points
1954	14	3.6	1964	12	3.3
1955	13	3.6	1965	11	3.2
1956	26	3.7	1966	14	3.8
1957	18	3.8	1967	9	3.9
1958	21	3.5	1968	27	4.0
1959	13	4.5	1969	26	3.8
1960	14	3.1	1970	24	3.5
1961	11	3.3	1971	17	3.5
1962	13	3.3	1972	17	2.8
1963	3	3.3	1973	15	3.5
			1974	21	3.7

The findings presented in Table Q 51 #3 indicated that

in terms of an overall pattern, a tendency toward earlier marriages was evident in the responses of generic program respondents in Classes 1954 through 1964, while a tendency toward later marriages was evident in the responses of respondents in Classes 1965 through 1974; these trends are more clearly evident if the two extreme values, those recorded for the Class of 1959 and the Class of 1972, are disregarded.

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

Question 52. "What was your fiancé's activity when you became engaged? (Circle one)"

There were 416 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 52 #1.

Table Q 52 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement

Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement	Responses N	Responses %
A student attending the UT Medical Units	113	27.2
An undergraduate student, but not in attendance at UT Medical Units	66	15.9
A graduate student	27	6.5
A qualified practitioner in a health related field	46	11.1
None of these is applicable	164	39.4
Total	416	100.1

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses recorded for each of the five options for fiancé activity by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 52 #2.

Table Q 52 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Student attending UT Medical Units	113	27.2	107	29.4	6	11.5
Undergraduate student, non UTMU	66	15.9	63	17.3	3	5.8
Graduate student	27	6.5	22	6.0	5	9.6
Qualified practioner in health related field	46	11.1	45	12.4	1	1.9
None of these is applicable	164	39.4	127	34.9	37	71.2
Total	416	100.1	364	100.0	52	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 52 #2 indicated that

the proportion of registered nurse program respondents that used the option "none of these is applicable" was twice what it was for the generic program respondents; this is not surprising since three out of the other four options described activities of students and 42.3% of the registered nurse program respondents were married at the time they enrolled at UTCN (Table Q 51 #2).

Respondents who identified the fact that the fiancé was an undergraduate student attending The University of Tennessee Medical Units were asked to specify the College of attendance. The distribution of the 113 responses among the Colleges, Schools and Programs at the Medical Units is presented in Table Q 52 #3.

Table Q 52 #3. Percent of Responses for Fiancé Attendance at UT Medical Units by College/School/Program

The University Of Tennessee Medical Units College/School/Program	Responses N	%
College of Medicine	62	54.9
College of Dentistry	29	25.7
College of Pharmacy	12	10.6
Graduate School – Medical Sciences	6	5.3
Medical Resident and Intern Programs	3	2.7
School of Social Work	1	0.9
Total	113	100.1

The number and percent of the 109 responses that indicated fiancé attendance at the College of Medicine, the College of Dentistry, the College of Pharmacy and the Graduate School of Basic Medical Science is presented by Class in Table Q 52 #4.

These 109 responses include the 6 from registered nurse program respondents who identified fiancés who attended the UT Medical Units (Table Q 52 #2).

The three respondents who identified fiancés as residents and interns were members, one each, of Classes 1959, 1961 and 1971. The respondent who identified fiancé attendance at the School of Social Work was a member of Class 1970.

Table Q 52 #4. Percent of Responses for Four UT Medical Units Colleges for Fiancé Attendance, by Respondent's Class

		UT Medical Units College Attended by Fiancé			
	Resp	Medicine		Dentistry	
Class	N	N	%	N	%
1954	5	4	80.0	1	20.0
1955	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
1956	10	6	60.0	4	40.0
1957	6	3	50.0	1	16.7
1958	4	2	50.0	1	25.0
1959	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1960	7	4	57.1	2	28.6
1961	8	8	100.0	0	0.0
1962	6	4	66.7	2	33.3
1963	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
1964	3	1	33.3	1	33.3
1965	5	3	60.0	1	20.0
1966	7	4	57.1	2	28.6
1967	3	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	7	4	57.1	2	28.6
1969	9	5	55.6	1	11.1
1970	6	3	50.0	1	16.7
1971	4	1	25.0	2	50.0
1972	8	3	37.5	4	50.0
1973	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1974	5	4	80.0	1	20.0
Total	109	62	AV56.9	29	AV26.6

Table Q 52 #4. Percent of Responses for Four UT Medical Units Fiancé Attendance, by
(Continued) Respondent's Class.

		UT Medical Units College Attended by Fiancé			
	Resp	Pharmacy		Basic Med. Sciences	
Class	N	N	%	N	%
1954	5	0	0.0	0	0.0
1955	1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1956	10	0	0.0	0	0.0
1957	6	1	16.7	1	16.7
1958	4	1	25.0	0	0.0
1959	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1960	7	1	14.3	0	0.0
1961	8	0	0.0	0	0.0
1962	6	0	0.0	0	0.0
1963	2	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	3	0	0.0	1	33.3
1965	5	0	0.0	1	20.0
1966	7	0	0.0	1	14.3
1967	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1968	7	1	14.3	0	0.0
1969	9	3	33.3	0	0.0
1970	6	2	33.3	0	0.0
1971	4	1	25.0	0	0.0
1972	8	1	12.5	0	0.0
1973	3	0	0.0	0	0.0
1974	5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	109	12	AV 11.0	6	AV 5.5

The findings derived from responses to Questions 51 and 52 provided the basis for these observations:

two thirds of the ever married respondents to Q One married either while attending UTCN or within one year after graduation (Table Q 51 #1);

fiancés attending The University of Tennessee Medical Units constituted 38.3% of all fiancés (Table Q 52 #1);

one out of every two respondents who married either while attending UTCN or within one year after graduation, married a person who was either a student in a College of the Medical Units or a qualified practitioner in a health related field;

the Classes of 1959 and 1967 were each unique; the former recorded no fiancé among the students in the Colleges of the Medical Units and the latter recorded no fiancé in either the College of Medicine or the College of Dentistry and twice as many attending the School of Basic Medical Sciences as attending the College of Pharmacy;

with only minor deviations, the pattern of fiancé attendance among the four Colleges, Class by Class, remained quite consistent; only during the late sixties and early seventies (years of enrollment of respondents as distinct from years of graduation) did the Colleges of Dentistry and Pharmacy attain equal rates with the College of Medicine in this regard.

The largest percent of responses, 18.3% came from married respondents, under 25 years of age with no children.

Next, in descending order of magnitude of the percent of responses were
14.0% from married respondents aged 25–45 years with no children
12.5% from respondents who had never married, aged 25–45 years
11.0% from married respondents with all children under 30 months of age
8.5% from respondents who had never married, age under 25 years
8.3% from married respondents with all children ages 2½ to 6 years
7.9% from married respondents with oldest child under 13 and youngest from 2½ – 6 years of age
7.0% from married respondents with oldest child under 6 and youngest under 30 months of age

Responses to these eight categories constitute 87.5% of the total responses to the twenty five categories.

Responses from respondents 21–45 years of age having no children constitute 53.3% of responses.

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

Question 48. "Please circle the code number of the one category which best describes your age and family situation. "Children" applies to one child and more."

There were 529 usable responses and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 48 #1.

Table Q 48 #1. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories.

Age and Family Situation	Responses	
	N	%
Age under 25, never married	45	8.5
Age 25–45, never married	66	12.5
Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0
Age 65 or more, never married	0	0.0
No children, age under 25	97	18.3
No children, age 25–45	74	14.0
No children, age 45–64	7	1.3
No children age 65 and over	0	0.0
All children under 30 months	58	11.0
Oldest child under 6, youngest under 30 months	37	7.0
Oldest child under 13, youngest under 30 months	19	3.6
All children ages 2½ to 6 years	44	8.3
Oldest child under 13 years, youngest 2½–6	42	7.9
All children ages 6–13 years	21	4.0
Oldest child under 20, youngest under 2½	2	0.4
Oldest child under 20, youngest 2½–6	3	0.6
Oldest child under 20 youngest 6–13	6	1.1
All children ages 13–20 years	3	0.6
Oldest child left household, youngest under 2½	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 2½–6	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 6–13	0	0.0
Oldest child left household youngest 13–20	1	0.2
Oldest child left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0
Ages 45–65, all children gone from household	4	0.8
Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0
Total	529	100.1

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses recorded in each category by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 48 #2.

Table Q 48 #2. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories by Respondents' UTCN Program

Age and Family Situation	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age under 25, never married	45	8.5	45	9.9	0	0.0
Age 25–45 never married	66	12.5	43	9.5	23	31.1
Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Age 65 or more never married	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No children–age under 25	97	18.3	97	21.3	0	0.0
No children–age 25–45	74	14.0	59	13.0	15	20.3
No children–age 45–64	7	1.3	0	0.0	7	9.5
No children–age 65 or over	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
All children under 30 months	58	11.0	54	11.9	4	5.4
Oldest under 6, youngest under 30 months	37	7.0	35	7.7	2	2.7
Oldest under 13 youngest under 30 months	19	3.6	19	4.2	0	0.0
All children 2½–6	44	8.3	42	9.2	2	2.7
Oldest under 13, youngest 2½–6	42	7.9	39	8.6	3	4.1
All children ages 6–13	21	4.0	18	4.0	3	4.1
Oldest under 20, youngest under 2½	2	0.4	1	0.2	1	1.4
Oldest under 20, youngest 2½–6	3	0.6	1	0.2	2	2.7
Oldest under 20, youngest 6–13	6	1.1	1	0.2	5	6.8
All children ages 13–20	3	0.6	1	0.2	2	2.7
Oldest left houshold, youngest under 2½	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oldest left household, youngest 2½–6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oldest left household, youngest 6–13	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oldest left household, youngest 13–20	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	1.4
Oldest left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ages 45–65, all children gone from household	4	0.8	0	0.0	4	5.4
Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	529	100.1	455	100.1	74	100.3

The findings in Table Q 48 #2 indicated that

respondents in the registered nurse program group were older than those in the generic program group

in the 25–45 year age bracket a higher proportion of registered nurse program respondents had never married than was the case for the generic program respondents.

the proportion of respondents in each group that had children was the same, 57% of respondents.

Question 48 was repeated on Q Two as Question 23. There were 213 usable responses to Question 23 Q Two and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 48 #3.

Table Q 48 #3. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories Q Two.

Age and Family Situation	Responses N	Responses %
Age under 25, never married	0	0.0
Age 25–45, never married	25	11.7
Age 45–65 never married	2	0.9
Age 65 or more, never married	0	0.0
No children, age under 25	0	0.0
No children, age 25–45	12	5.6
No children age 45–64	4	1.9
No children, age 65 and over	1	0.5
All children under 30 months	10	4.7
Oldest child under 6, youngest under 30 months	28	13.1
Oldest child under 13, youngest under 30 months	22	10.3
All children ages 2½–6 years	22	10.3
Oldest child under 13, youngest 2½–6 years	*Omitted from Q Two	
All children ages 6–13 years	32	15.0
Oldest child under 20, youngest under 2½ yrs	*Omitted from Q Two	
Oldest child under 20, youngest 2½–6 years	11	5.2
Oldest child under 20, youngest 6–13 years	29	13.6
All children ages 13 to 20 years	10	4.7
Oldest child left household, youngest under 2½ yrs	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 2½–6 years	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 6–13 years	1	0.5
Oldest child left household, youngest 13–20 years	2	0.9
Oldest child left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0
Age 45–65, all children gone from household	2	0.9
Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0
Total	213	99.8

---

*Due to typographical error

The findings presented in Tables Q 48 #1 and #3 were not interpreted for the following reasons:

the omissions of data due to errors in Q Two diluted the value of the findings;

although the respondents who answered Q Two were relatively representative of those who answered Q One in terms of rate of employment (Table Q 10 #9 p. 32, Volume 1) there was no foundation for assuming that they were representative of the Q One respondent population in the matter of age and family situation. In fact, the data indicated that they were not.

The number and percent of responses from 92 of the persons in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample to Question 48 Q One and Question 23 Q Two are presented in Table Q 48 #4.

Table Q 48 #4. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Age and Family Situation Categories by Q One and Q Two

Questionnaire One Responses		Age and Family Situation	Questionnaire Two Responses	
N	Percent		N	Percent
17	18.5	Age under 25, never married	0	0
7	7.6	Age 25–45 never married	12	17.0
0	0.0	Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0
0	0.0	Age 65 or more never married	0	0.0
36	39.1	No children, age under 25	0	0.0
13	14.1	No children, age 25–45	7	9.9
0	0.0	No children, age 45–65	1	1.4
0	0.0	No children, age 65 and over	0	0.0
11	12.0	All children under 30 months	8	11.3
1	1.1	Oldest under 6, youngest under 30 mos.	20	28.2
0	0.0	Oldest under 13, youngest under 30 mos.	1	1.4
3	3.3	All children, ages 2½–6	13	18.3
1	1.1	Oldest under 13 youngest 2½–6	Omitted	
0	0.0	All children ages 6 to 13	3	4.2
0	0.0	Oldest under 20, youngest under 2½	Omitted	
0	0.0	Oldest under 20, youngest 2½ to 6	3	4.2
1	1.1	Oldest under 20 youngest 6 to 13	0	0.0
0	0.0	All children ages 13 to 20	1	1.4
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest under 2½	0	0.0
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest 2½–6	0	0.0
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest 6–13	0	0.0
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest 13–20	1	1.4
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0
2	2.2	Age 45–65, from household all children gone	1	1.4
0	0.0	Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0
92	100.1	Total	*71	100.1

*The 21 missing respondents were in the categories that were omitted by error

The findings in Table Q 48 #4 indicated that

in the five year period between questionnaires, unmarried respondents married to the extent that only 12, 13.0% of the sample of 92 respondents, remained unmarried at the end of the five year interval.

family situations in which all children were under the age of 6 years rose from 16.4% of the responses on Q One to 44.6% of the sample of 92 respondents at the end of the five year interval. The implication was that, not only the respondents who married during the five year interval but also a fair number of those who were married on Q One, still had children under six years of age by the time they had been out of school for seven years. Again, by implication, this finding supports the fact that the sharp drop in the rate of employment among respondents came in the fifth to seventh year after graduation (Table Q 12 #7 Volume 1).

Question 50: "How many children do you have now living? (Circle one)."

There were 421 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 50 #1.

Table Q 50 #1. Percent of Responses for 7 Options for Number of Living Children

Number of Living Children	Responses N	Responses %
None	185	43.9
One	78	18.5
Two	84	20.0
Three	53	12.6
Four	19	4.5
Five	1	0.2
Six or more	1	0.2
Total	421	99.9

These findings and those for Questions 48 and 49 were reviewed to determine why only 421 persons responded to question 50 while 529 responded to Question 48 and 530 responded to Question 49. Respondents were divided into two categories, those that reported having children and those that reported having no children. The findings were as follows:

	Question 48	Question 50
	Options 1–8	Option 1
Respondents with no children	N= 289	N= 185
	Options 9–25	Options 2–7
Respondents with children	N= 240	N= 236

It appeared that, understandably, 104 of the 113 respondents who recorded in Question 49 (marital status) that they had never married, did not answer Question 50. The 185 respondents that recorded that they had no children in Question 50 corresponds relatively closely to the 178 who reported that they were married and had no children in Question 48.

The findings in Table Q 50 #1 indicated that the average number of children per respondent was 1.17.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses in each category of number of living children for generic program and registered nurse program respondents.

These findings are presented in Table Q 50 #2.

Table Q 50 #2. Percent of Responses for 7 Options of Number of Living Children by Respondents' UTCN Program

Number of Living Children	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	185	43.9	159	43.2	26	49.0
One	78	18.5	73	19.8	5	9.4
Two	84	20.0	70	19.0	14	26.4
Three	53	12.6	47	12.8	6	11.3
Four	19	4.5	19	5.2	0	0.0
Five	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	1.9
Six or more	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	1.9
Total	421	99.9	368	100.0	53	99.9

The findings in Table Q 50 #2 indicated that the average number of children per respondent for both program groups was the same, 1.17.

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

Question 55: "What is (was) your husband's occupation? (Circle one)."

There were 332 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 55 #1.

Table Q 55 #1. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband

Occupation of Husband	Responses	
	N	%
Professional (teacher, dentist, engineer, lawyer, doctor, minister)	205	61.7
Business official or executive (manager, buyer, factory supervisor, personnel director)	30	9.0
Student	28	8.4
Technician or semi–professional worker (lab technician, draftsman)	20	6.0
Salesman (wholesale or retail)	16	4.8
Proprietor (self employed business man, store owner, contractor, distributor)	9	2.7
Clerical worker. (office bookkeeper, office machine operator)	7	2.1
Skilled operator or machine operator (factory, machine worker, bus driver)	6	1.8
Service worker (policeman, fireman, waiter, barber, cook)	6	1.8
Farm owner or manager	2	0.6
Laborer	2	0.6
Retired	1	0.3
Farm worker	0	0.0
Total	*332*	99.8

*There is a discrepancy between the number of respondents who, in response to Question 49 Q One, (marital status) indicated that they were married or had at one time been married, a total of 417, and the number who provided information about the occupation of the husband, a total of 332. This discrepancy may be due in some part to the way the instructions were phrased for Questions 54 and 55. The instructions began "If not presently married,"– This statement was not meant to discourage those 22 persons who were widowed, divorced or separated from answering Question 55 but it may have done so if they did not read the remainder of the instructions which asked them to answer Questions 54 and 55 in terms of their former husbands. It appears that the 103 persons who reported being married at one time, but who did not answer Question 54 concerning the husband's attitude toward their employment as nurses (Table Q 54 #1 Chapter 3) and the 85 persons who, although they recorded being married at one time, did not answer Question 55 concerning the husband's occupation, simply preferred not to give this information about their husbands.

Using four broad categories of occupations it was possible to collapse the responses to the thirteen options in Question 55 as presented in Table Q 55 #2.

Table Q 55 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband

Categories of Occupation of Husband	Responses N	Responses %
Professional	205	61.7
Business related; proprietor, business official, salesman, clerical worker, farm owner or manager, technician or semi professional worker	*85	25.6
Service or labor related; skilled operator or machine operator, service worker, laborer, farm worker	14	4.2
Student	28	8.4
Total	332	99.9

The percent of responses in these four categories, by Class, is presented in Table Q 55 #3.

---

*Includes one response recorded under retired; former occupation was proprietor

Table Q 55 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Class.

Class	Occupation of Husband					
	Respon– dent N	Grad- Resp. Int. Years	Professional N	%	Business Related N	%
1954	18	13	14	77.7	3	16.6
1955	17	12	9	52.9	8	47.1
1956	28	11	21	75.0	4	14.3
1957	19	10	14	73.7	4	21.1
1958	26	9	14	53.8	12	46.2
1959	16	8	8	50.0	6	37.5
1960	13	7	11	84.6	2	15.4
1961	13	6	10	76.9	2	15.4
1962	13	5	7	53.8	5	38.5
1963	4	4	3	75.0	1	25.0
1964	9	3	5	55.6	1	11.1
1965	12	2	5	41.7	3	25.0
1966	13	2	9	69.2	2	15.4
1967	8	2	4	50.0	1	12.5
1968	23	2	15	65.2	6	26.1
1969	20	2	7	35.0	8	40.0
1970	20	2	12	60.0	2	10.0
1971	12	2	7	58.3	3	25.0
1972	16	2	10	62.5	3	18.8
1973	15	2	8	53.3	6	40.0
1974	17	2	12	70.6	3	17.6
Totals	332		205	AV 61.7	85	AV 25.6

Table Q 55 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Class. (Continued)

			Occupation of Husband			
Class	Respondent N	Grad–Resp. Int. Years	Service and Labor Related N	%	Student N	%
1954	18	13	1	5.5	0	0.0
1955	17	12	0	0.0	0	0.0
1956	28	11	1	3.6	2	7.1
1957	19	10	0	0.0	1	5.3
1958	26	9	0	0.0	0	0.0
1959	16	8	1	6.3	1	6.3
1960	13	7	0	0.0	0	0.0
1961	13	6	0	0.0	1	7.7
1962	13	5	1	7.7	0	0.0
1963	4	4	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	9	3	1	11.1	2	22.2
1965	12	2	1	8.3	3	25.0
1966	13	2	1	7.7	1	7.7
1967	8	2	1	12.5	2	25.0
1968	23	2	0	0.0	2	8.7
1969	20	2	2	10.0	3	15.0
1970	20	2	1	5.0	5	25.0
1971	12	2	2	16.7	0	0.0
1972	16	2	1	6.3	2	12.5
1973	15	2	0	0.0	1	6.7
1974	17	2	0	0.0	2	11.8
Totals	332		14	AV 4.2	28	AV 8.4

Based on two graduation–response intervals, a comparison was made of the percent of responses recorded for the 4 categories of husband's occupation. The findings are presented in Table Q 55 #4.

Table Q 55 #4. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Two Graduation Response Intervals.

Graduation Response Intervals	Categories of Husband Occupation: Professional N	%	Business Related N	%	Service/ Labor Rel. N	%	Student N	%
3–13 Years N = 176	116	65.9	48	27.3	5	2.8	7	4.0
2 Years N = 156	89	57.1	37	23.7	9	5.8	21	13.5

The writers consider this assumption is warranted, namely,

the differences of proportions of husbands in the four categories is due almost entirely to the difference in the graduation–response interval and the proportions will be equalized as some husbands who are in the student and service and labor categories move, with time, into the business and professional categories; the difference in the proportion of responses in the category of student for the two graduation–response interval groups is understandable on the basis of the difference in age of the respondents in the two groups; two thirds of the husbands identified as students in the 2 year graduation–response interval group have moved into the professional category by the time the respondent is in the 3–13 year graduation–response interval group.

Respondents who indicated that their husbands' occupations were professional were asked to specify the profession; the following were identified:

86 husbands were physicians including 2 orthopedic surgeons, 2 internists, 1 pathologist, 1 psychiatrist, 1 physician/researcher
27 husbands were dentists
18 husbands were pharmacists including 1 pharmacologist
15 husbands were teachers including 1 principal and 1 educational specialist
11 husbands were engineers
8 husbands were armed forces officers
7 husbands were optometrists
4 husbands were chemists including 1 biochemist
3 each were environmentalists, lawyers and accountants
2 each were pilots and ministers
1 each was a game and fish officer, a government career worker, a social worker, a systems analyst, a marketing specialist, a real estate appraiser, an insurance adjuster, a bacteriologist, a veterinarian, a physicist, a psychologist, a musician

in 4 cases there was no specification; one retired husband had been a proprietor.

Using six categories of professional occupations it was possible to group these specified responses as presented in Table Q 55 #5.

Table Q 55 #5. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Professions of Husbands

Profession of Husband	Responses N	Responses %
Health related; physician, dentist, pharmacist, optometrist	138	68.7
Education related; teacher, principal, specialist	15	7.5
Engineer	11	5.5
Lawyer	3	1.5
Minister	2	1.0
All others that were specified	32	15.9
Total	201	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 55 recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 55 #6.

Table Q 55 #6. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program

Occupation of Husband	Total Population Responses N	%	General Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Professional	205	61.7	189	64.3	16	43.2
Proprietor	9	2.7	3	1.0	5	13.5
Business Official	30	9.0	25	8.5	5	13.5
Salesman	16	4.8	13	4.4	3	8.1
Clerical Workers	7	2.1	7	2.4	0	0.0
Farm Owner	2	0.6	2	0.7	0	0.0
Farm Worker	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Technician	20	6.0	18	6.1	2	5.4
Skilled Operator	6	1.8	4	1.4	2	5.4
Service Worker	6	1.8	4	1.4	2	5.4
Laborer	2	0.6	1	0.3	1	2.7
Student	28	8.4	28	9.5	0	0.0
Retired	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	2.7
Total	332	99.8	294	100.0	37	99.9

Using the 4 categories of husband's occupation that were established previously it was possible to collapse these responses as presented in Table Q 55 #7.

Table Q 55 #7. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband in 4 Categories, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Large Categories of Occupations	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Professional	205	61.7	189	64.3	16	43.2
Business Related	* 85	25.6	68	23.1	*16	43.2
Service–Labor Related	14	4.2	9	3.1	5	13.5
Student	28	8.4	28	9.5	0	0.0
Total	332	99.9	294	100.0	37	99.9

The findings presented in Table Q 55 #7 indicated that

although the categories of professional and business related occupations accounted for more than 85% of the husbands' occupations in both the generic and registered nurse program groups, the distribution of responses between these two categories was dissimilar for the two groups of respondents; for the generic program respondents, there were three times the number of husbands in professional occupations as in business related occupations for the registered nurse program respondents, the distribution was equal in these two occupation categories.

**Includes one response recorded under retired; former occupation was proprietor*

A comparison was made of the specified professions that were provided by respondents who identified the occupation of the husband as professional. The responses were collapsed into the six categories developed previously and they are presented, by the respondents' UTCN program in Table Q 55 #8.

Table Q 55 #8. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Profession of Husband, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Categories of Profession of Husband	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Health Related Professions	138	68.7	132	70.9	6	40.0
Education Related Professions	15	7.5	11	5.9	4	26.6
Engineer	11	5.5	11	5.9	0	0.0
Lawyer	3	1.5	1	0.5	2	13.3
Minister	2	1.0	2	1.1	0	0.0
All others that were specified	32	15.9	29	15.6	3	20.0
Total	201	100.1	186	99.9	15	99.9

The findings in Table Q 55 #8 indicated that

a higher proportion of generic program respondents were married to husbands in the health related professions and engineering than was the case for registered nurse program respondents;

a higher proportion of registered nurse program respondents were married to husbands in the education related professions and the legal profession than was the case for the generic program respondents;

the proportion married to husbands in all the other professions that were specified was relatively equal for both program groups.

These interpretations of the findings must be considered with due attention to the small number of respondents in the registered nurse program group.

Question 53: "Is your husband presently in the armed forces? (Circle one)."

There were 413 usable responses:

71 (17.2%) answered "yes"; 342 (82.8%) answered "no".

The years in which this question was answered were 1967 through 1976. The percent of positive responses, by the year in which the response was made, is presented in Table Q 53 #1.

Table Q 53 #1. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces, by Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval

Graduation – Response Interval	Year in Which Response Was Recorded	Percent of Positive Responses Made Each Year
3–13 years	1967	AV. 12.2%
2 years	1968	27.8
2 years	1969	44.4
2 years	1970	24.1
2 years	1971	25.0
2 years	1972	12.0
2 years	1973	23.8
2 years	1974	15.8
2 years	1975	17.6
2 years	1976	28.0

The writers surmised that the high proportion of respondents with husbands in the armed forces was related to the Vietnam War years and the age of the respondent, the presumed age of the husband and his eligibility for military service.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to the two options in Question 53 by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 53 #2.

Table Q 53 #2. Percent of Responses for Husband's Status with Armed Forces, by Respondents' UTCN Program

"Is your husband presently in the armed forces?"	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	71	17.2	68	18.7	3	6.1
No	342	82.8	296	81.3	46	93.9
Total	413	100.0	364	100.0	49	100.0

The writers surmised that the differences evident here may have been related directly to the age brackets of the two groups of respondents.

The percent of positive responses, by the year in which the response was made by two graduation–response intervals and by the respondents' UTCN program is presented in Table Q 53 #3.

Table Q 53 #3. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces by Respondents' UTCN Program, Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval

Grad.–Response Interval Years	Year in Which Response Was Recorded	Percent of Responses that were Positive. Generic Program Respondents N = 364	Registered Nurse Program Respondents N = 49
3–13	1967	AV 13.3	AV 3.7
2	1968	28.6	25.0
2	1969	44.4	0.0
2	1970	25.9	0.0
2	1971	24.0	33.0
2	1972	12.5	0.0
2	1973	29.4	0.0
2	1974	17.6	0.0
2	1975	20.0	0.0
2	1976	33.3	0.0
		AV 24.9	7.4

Chapter 3

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTIONS

The subjects of career choice and career satisfactions are addressed next in this study.

CAREER CHOICE

Question 57: "Which of the following factors do you feel most influenced your choice of nursing? (Circle one)."

There were 522 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 57 #1.

Table Q 57 #1. Percent of Responses for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing

Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Responses N	Responses %
Parents or immediate relatives	130	24.9
Don't know	125	23.9
Other	91	17.4
Someone in the field of nursing	55	10.5
Summer job in hospital or health related field	49	9.4
Someone in the general health field, e.g. doctor, dentist	39	7.5
Teachers (at any level)	15	2.9
Active recruitment on part of nursing (e.g. brochures, clubs, films)	13	2.5
Financial pressures	5	1.0
Military experience	0	0.0
Total	522	100.0

Respondents who indicated that they had been most influenced by "other" factors were asked to specify the influence:

33 respondents identified personal desire to be a nurse;
10 each identified service to humanity and an interest in general science, and/or health related studies and/or medical sciences;
8 identified personal experience, as being a patient;
5 identified illness and/or death in the immediate family;
4 each identified a call to serve God and the personal and financial security of the occupation;
3 identified books and stories about nursing;
2 each identified experience as a volunteer, a friend, vocational aptitude testing results, and a desire to study medicine that was thwarted by insufficient funds;
1 each identified a need for personal fulfillment, the challenging nature of nursing, recruitment by a mission board, the parents of a child with whom she "baby sat" and the opportunity to combine the study of nursing with a college education;
1 respondent who marked the "other" option did not specify an influence.

Although Question 57 did not ask for information concerning the age at which the respondent made the choice of nursing, a number of those who used the "other" option included a statement to the effect that the choice was made in childhood; a number stated that the choice once made was permanent; a number stated that the choice was made so early that the respondent could not remember a time in her life that did not include the choice. These respondents totalled 20.

It was the judgment of the writers that the 33 respondents who stated that personal desire for nursing was the factor that most influenced their choice, offered in fact, no more definitive information than did the respondents who identified the option "don't know". When their responses are taken from the "other" option and added to the "don't know" option, the findings are as presented in Table Q 57 #2.

Table Q 57 #2. Percent of Responses (Reorganized) for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing

Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Responses N	%
Don't know and personal desire	158	30.3
Parents or immediate family	130	24.9
Other	58	11.1
Someone in the field of nursing	55	10.5
Summer job in hospital or health related field	49	9.4
Someone in the general health field (e.g. doctor, dentist)	39	7.5
Teachers (at any level)	15	2.9
Active recruitment on the part of nursing e.g. brochures, clubs, films)	13	2.5
Financial pressure	5	1.0
Military experience	0	0.0
Total	522	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 57 recorded by the generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 57 #3.

Table Q 57 #3. Percent of Responses for Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program

Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parents or immediate relatives	130	24.9	114	25.6	16	21.1
Teachers	15	2.9	10	2.2	5	6.6
Someone in the field of nursing	55	10.5	41	9.2	14	18.4
Military experience	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Financial pressure	5	1.0	3	0.7	2	2.6
Summer job in hospital	49	9.4	47	10.5	2	2.6
Active recruitment by nursing	13	2.5	11	2.5	2	2.6
Someone in general health field	39	7.5	32	7.2	7	9.2
Other	91	17.4	82	18.4	9	11.8
Don't know	125	23.9	106	23.8	19	25.0
Total	522	100.0	446	100.1	76	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 57 #2 and #3 indicated that

approximately one third of the respondents could not identify with any precision the factor that most influenced their choice of nursing;

approximately one fourth of the respondents identified family influence as being the most important factor in their choice;

approximately one fourth of the respondents identified nurses, other health professionals and employment in a health related field (combined) as being the most important factor in their choice;

the importance of contact with someone in the health field was underscored when the findings from Questions 3 and 4, presented in Chapter 1, were considered in this context; it was established in Question 4 that 12.1% of respondents' mothers had at least some education in nursing; a parsimonious estimate based on findings in Question 3, that one fifth of the fathers identified as having a professional occupation were physicians, produced a figure of 3.5% of the respondents' fathers; when this 15.6% was added to the percentages for "someone in the field of nursing", "summer job in a hospital or health related field" and "someone in the general health field", the proportion of responses for the influence of health professionals approached 45%; this finding suggested the central importance of personal contact with health professionals in the career choice of respondents in this study;

teachers and active recruitment conducted by nurses were identified by very few respondents as being the most important factor in the choice of nursing for a career;

the proportion of responses by generic and registered nurse program respondents was roughly equal for all the options with the exception of three; registered nurse program respondents identified teachers and nurses as being more influential and summer employment in a hospital or health related agency as being less influential in their career choices than did the generic program respondents.

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

Question 58: "How do you think each of the following classes in the general public currently regards a career in nursing? (Circle one number in each column)."

There were 522 responses recorded for the attitudes of the lower class, 525 for the attitudes of the middle class and 523 for the attitudes of the upper class. The percent of responses for the attitudes of the three classes are presented in Table Q 58 #1.

Table Q 58 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing

Attitudes toward Career in Nursing	Classes of General Public: Lower Class Responses N	%	Middle Class Responses N	%	Upper Class Responses N	%
Very favorable	284	54.4	161	30.7	32	6.3
Favorable	176	33.7	308	58.7	188	35.9
Indifferent	56	10.7	43	8.2	214	40.7
Unfavorable	3	0.6	9	1.7	71	13.6
Very unfavorable	3	0.6	4	0.8	18	3.4
Total	522	100.0	525	100.1	523	99.9

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 58 recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 58 #2.

Table Q 58 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of 3 Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program

	Lower Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Responses			
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	249	55.8	35	46.1
Favorable	148	33.2	28	36.8
Indifferent	44	9.9	12	15.8
Unfavorable	2	0.4	1	1.3
Very unfavorable	3	0.7	0	0.0
Total	446	100.0	76	100.0

	Middle Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Responses			
	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	138	30.7	23	30.3
Favorable	264	58.8	44	57.9
Indifferent	36	8.0	7	9.2
Unfavorable	7	1.6	2	2.6
Very unfavorable	4	0.9	0	0.0
Total	449	100.0	76	100.0

	Upper Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Responses			
	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	30	6.7	2	2.6
Favorable	170	38.0	18	23.7
Indifferent	181	40.5	33	43.4
Unfavorable	52	11.6	19	25.0
Very unfavorable	14	3.1	4	5.3
Total	447	99.9	76	100.0

Combining responses recorded under "very favorable" and "favorable" into one category designated approving and combining the responses recorded under "indifferent", "unfavorable" and "very unfavorable" into another category designated disapproving, it was possible to compare the perceptions respondents recorded about attitudes by lower, middle and upper classes of the general public and by Classes of respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 58 #3.

Table Q 58 #3. Percent of Responses for Approving and Disapproving Attitudes of Three Classes of of General Public, Toward Nursing Career, by Respondent's Class

Respondent's Class	Lower Class		Middle Class		Upper Class	
	App–roving Responses %	Disapp–roving Responses %	App–roving Responses %	Disapp–roving Responses %	App–roving Responses %	Disapp–roving Responses %
1954	86.4	13.5	76.1	23.9	33.3	66.7
1955	80.0	20.0	75.0	25.0	40.0	60.0
1956	84.3	15.6	87.5	12.6	40.6	59.4
1957	84.7	15.4	80.7	19.2	30.7	69.2
1958	88.2	11.7	82.3	17.6	23.5	76.5
1959	84.2	15.8	95.0	05.0	45.0	55.0
1960	75.0	25.0	90.0	10.0	45.0	55.0
1961	85.8	14.3	95.2	04.8	38.1	61.9
1962	85.7	14.3	95.4	04.5	52.4	47.7
1963	85.7	14.3	100.0	00.0	57.1	42.9
1964	95.0	05.0	80.0	20.0	20.0	80.0
1965	90.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	40.0	60.0
1966	85.2	14.8	96.5	03.6	21.5	78.5
1967	100.0	00.0	83.3	16.6	50.0	50.0
1968	94.6	05.4	83.8	16.2	32.4	67.5
1969	87.1	12.9	96.8	03.2	58.1	41.9
1970	86.5	13.5	94.5	05.4	64.9	35.1
1971	96.7	03.3	100.0	00.0	50.0	50.0
1972	95.3	04.8	85.7	14.3	47.6	52.4
1973	87.5	12.5	100.0	00.0	45.8	54.2
1974	90.3	09.7	90.2	9.7	51.2	48.8
Classes 1954–63	AV 84.0	15.9	87.7	12.2	40.5	59.4
Classes 1964–74	AV 91.6	8.4	91.0	9.0	43.7	56.2

The findings presented in Tables Q 58 #1, #2 and #3 indicated that

overall, the respondents thought that persons belonging to the lower and middle classes felt favorably toward a career in nursing while persons in the upper class, although still approving of nursing as a career, felt less strongly about it and were indifferent to it to a much greater degree than were persons in the lower and middle classes;

the perceptions of the generic and registered nurse program respondents were roughly the same in their assessment of middle class attitudes toward nursing as a career;

registered nurse program respondents thought there was a greater degree of indifference to nursing as a career among persons in the lower class than did the generic program respondents; otherwise, the assessment of lower class attitudes by the two program groups was similar;

the major differences in perception of attitudes between the two program groups appeared in relation to the attitudes of the upper class; both groups felt the degree of indifference toward a career in nursing was relatively high among the upper class; however, when the indifferent responses were set aside, it was evident that generic program respondents thought the upper class attitude was more favorable to a career in nursing than did the registered nurse program respondents;

there was an average of 3 percentage points increase, with time, in the favorable assessments perceived for both middle and upper classes when the responses from members of the Classes that graduated in 1963 and before were compared with responses from members of Classes that graduated in 1964 and after; for the favorable assessment by the lower class, this average was a 7.6 percentage point increase for the same Class groupings; this was interpreted as meaning that over the 21 years covered in this study, respondents perceived the attitude the general public had toward nursing as a career to have become slightly more favorable; most of the shift toward a more positive attitude was attributed to the change they perceived in the attitude of the lower class.

Question 58 was repeated, unchanged, as Question 27 on Q Two.

There were 238 responses recorded for attitudes of the lower class, 241 responses recorded for attitudes of the middle class and 239 recorded for attitudes of the upper class on Q Two. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table Q 58 #4.

Table Q 58 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q Two

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Classes of the General Public Lower Class Responses		Middle Class Responses		Upper Class Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	153	64.3	74	30.7	15	6.3
Favorable	58	24.4	154	63.9	93	38.9
Indifferent	22	9.2	6	2.5	93	38.9
Unfavorable	3	1.3	5	2.1	31	13.0
Very unfavorable	2	0.8	2	0.8	7	2.9
Total	238	100.0	241	100.0	239	100.0

A comparison was made of the percent of responses to Question 58 Q One and Question 27 Q Two. The findings are presented in Table Q 58 #5.

Table Q 58 #5. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Classes of the General Public Lower Class Responses Q One N = 522 %	Q Two N = 238 %	Middle Class Responses Q One N = 525 %	Q Two N = 241 %	Upper Class Responses Q One N = 523 %	Q Two N = 239 %
Very favorable	54.4	64.3	30.7	30.7	6.3	6.3
Favorable	33.7	24.4	58.7	63.9	35.9	38.9
Indifferent	10.7	9.2	8.2	2.5	40.7	38.9
Unfavorable	0.6	1.3	1.7	2.1	13.6	13.0
Very unfavorable	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.4	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0

The total number and percent of responses recorded for each attitude as perceived for all three classes of the general public on Q One and Q Two is presented in Table Q 58 #6.

Table Q 58 #6. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	General Public Q One Responses N	%	Q Two Responses N	%
Very favorable	477	30.4	242	33.7
Favorable	672	42.8	305	42.5
Indifferent	313	19.9	121	16.9
Unfavorable	83	5.3	39	5.4
Very unfavorable	25	1.6	11	1.5
Total	1570	100.0	718	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 58 #6 indicated that

respondents to Q Two recorded perceptions that gave evidence of a slight shift, with time, toward more favorable attitudes toward a career in nursing attributed to the general public; the 3% shift occurred from the indifferent to the very favorable attitude; this shift is attributable differentially, however, to the three socio–economic classes of the general public, as evident in previous presentations of the data.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 27 Q Two recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 58 #7.

Table Q 58 #7. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing, by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two

	Lower Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	Responses %	N	%
Very favorable	135	64.3	18	64.3
Favorable	51	24.3	7	25.0
Indifferent	20	9.5	2	7.1
Unfavorable	3	1.4	0	0.0
Very unfavorable	1	0.5	1	3.6
Total	210	100.0	28	100.0

	Middle Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	Responses %	N	%
Very favorable	68	31.9	6	21.4
Favorable	133	62.4	21	75.0
Indifferent	6	2.8	0	0.0
Unfavorable	5	2.3	0	0.0
Very unfavorable	1	0.5	1	3.6
Total	213	99.9	28	100.0

	Upper Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	Responses %	N	%
Very favorable	14	6.6	1	3.6
Favorable	84	39.8	9	32.1
Indifferent	83	39.3	10	35.7
Unfavorable	26	12.3	5	17.9
Very unfavorable	4	1.9	3	10.7
Total	211	99.9	28	100.0

Responses submitted by respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Questions 58 Q One and Question 27 Q Two are presented in Table Q 58 #8.

Table Q 58 #8. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing for Two Year–Seven Year Sample

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Lower Class Responses Q One N	%	Q Two N	%
Very favorable	55	59.8	59	64.8
Favorable	28	30.4	20	22.0
Indifferent	9	9.8	10	11.0
Unfavorable	0	0.0	1	1.1
Very unfavorable	0	0.0	1	1.1
Total	92	100.0	91	100.0

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Middle Class Responses Q One N	%	Q Two N	%
Very favorable	25	26.9	26	28.3
Favorable	58	62.4	59	64.1
Indifferent	9	9.7	4	4.3
Unfavorable	1	1.1	2	2.2
Very unfavorable	0	0.0	1	1.1
Total	93	100.1	92	100.0

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Upper Class Responses Q One N	%	Q Two N	%
Very favorable	4	4.3	3	3.3
Favorable	30	32.3	37	40.7
Indifferent	40	43.0	35	38.5
Unfavorable	15	16.1	12	13.2
Very unfavorable	4	4.3	4	4.4
Total	93	100.0	91	100.1

All the conclusions previously stated, that identified changes in perceived attitudes, must be interpreted cautiously because there are differences in the samples reporting on Q One and Q Two. Only in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample are the respondents identical for Q One and Q Two.

The findings presented in Tables Q 58 #1, #2, #4, #7 and #8 were analyzed further by assigning values of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 points to the attitudes in descending order from very favorable to very unfavorable. The findings of this analysis, based on the point values, are presented in Table Q 58 #9.

Table Q 58 #9. Mean Ratings of Responses from Various Populations for Perceived Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing of Three Classes of General Public

Classes of General Public	Q One Total Population N = 525	Q One Generic N = 449	Q One Reg. Nse N = 76	Q Two Total N = 241	Q Two Generic N = 213	Q Two Reg. Nse N = 28	Q One Sample 1 year N = 93	Q Two Sample 7 year N = 93
	Mean Points	Mean Points	Mean Points	Mean Points	Mean Points	Mean Points	Mean Points	Mean Points
Upper Class	3.28	3.32	2.93	3.33	3.37	3.00	3.16	3.25
Middle Class	4.17	4.17	4.16	4.22	4.23	4.10	4.15	4.16
Lower Class	4.38	4.43	4.28	4.44	4.44	4.46	4.50	4.48

The findings concerning respondents perceptions of attitudes of the three socio–economic classes of the public about a career in nursing indicated that

the overall pattern of these perceptions was consistent; respondents perceived that the lower class had the most positive attitude toward a career in nursing, the upper class had the least positive attitude and the attitude of the middle class fell in between;

changes in perceptions from Q One to Q Two for the total respondent population were slight but they were in a positive direction toward more favorable attitudes; perceptions of upper class attitudes were all toward more positive attitudes; for the lower and middle classes the trend was less consistent but it was, overall, in a positive direction; the one exception was the perception recorded on Q Two for middle class attitudes by the 28 registered nurse program respondents;

the lowest (least favorable) ratings were consistently perceived to be those of the upper class regardless of the nature of the population sample; the single lowest rating was attributed to the upper class by registered nurse program respondents on Q One, while the single highest rating attributed to the upper class was recorded by the generic program respondents on Q Two;

the greatest degree of consistency from one sample to another was found in the ratings given the perceptions of the middle class with a range of from 4.10 recorded by registered nurse program respondents on Q Two to 4.23 recorded by generic program respondents on Q Two;

the greatest discrepancy in ratings from one sample to another was found in the ratings given the perceptions of the upper class attitudes with a range from 2.93 recorded by the registered nurse program respondents on Q One to 3.37 recorded by generic program respondents on Q Two;

at no time and for no population sample did the highest rating attributed to the upper class reach the lowest rating attributed to the middle class, nor did the highest rating attributed to the middle class reach the lowest level attributed to the lower class;

on the basis of the relative consistency of the ratings the writers suggested that the ratings reflect the actual attitudes of the general public toward a career in nursing, most accurately by the middle class ratings, less accurately by the lower class ratings and least accurately by the upper class ratings; when the respondents recorded their perceptions of upper class attitudes they rated them as being much less favorable than the attitudes of people in the middle and lower classes; however, over time, respondents perceived attitudes toward a career in nursing as becoming more favorable on the part of the upper as well as the middle and lower classes.

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

Question 24: "What do you consider the most important nursing position you have ever held? (Place code number of position here from list in Question 20)."

There were 462 responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 24 #1.

Table Q 24 #1. Percent of Responses for Position Rated Most Important

Position Rated as Most Important	Responses N	%
Ståff or general duty nurse	189	40.9
Nursing instructor or assistant	101	21.9
Head nurse or assistant	65	14.1
Supervisor nurse or assistant	33	7.1
Other	31	6.7
Nursing administrator or assistant	15	3.2
Clinical specialist	14	3.0
Nursing education administrator or assistant	12	2.6
Nursing consultant	2	0.4
Total	462	99.9

When respondents checked the "other" option they were asked to identify the title of the position they considered to have been most important. The following positions were identified.

8	recorded pediatric nurse associate;
2	recorded each of clinical instructor, research nurse, inservice instructor, family nurse clinician;
1	recorded each of assistant to surgeon with private patients, flight nurse, army health nurse, supervisor of health occupations education, nurse anesthetist, physician's office nurse, team leader, school nurse, charge nurse, nurse practitioner at St. Jude Hospital, family planning nurse, nursing consultant and head nurse (combined), director of children and youth project, chairman of teaching department at hospital school of nursing, staff nurse and nursing instructor (combined).

A comparison was made between the responses to *Question 20, *Question 23 Part 3 and Question 24. The findings are recorded in Table Q 24 #2

Table Q 24 #2. Percent of Responses for Positions Held for One Year or more. Currently Held and Most Important

Type of Position	Question 20 Held 1 year or more		Question 23–3 Currently held		Question 24 Considered most important	
	Responses N	Responses %	Responses N	Responses %	Responses N	Responses %
Staff or general duty nurse	398	46.6	147	44.3	189	40.9
Head nurse or assistant	126	14.8	30	9.0	65	14.1
Supervisor nurse or assistant	66	7.7	22	6.6	33	7.1
Nursing administrator or assistant	24	2.8	11	3.3	15	3.2
Nursing consultant	6	0.7	2	0.6	2	0.4
Nursing instructor	150	17.6	67	20.2	101	21.9
Nursing education administrator or assistant	21	2.5	9	2.7	12	2.6
Clinical specialist	9	1.1	8	2.4	14	3.0
Other	54	6.3	36	10.8	31	6.7
Total	854	100.1	332	99.9	462	99.9

In three of the options that were offered, the proportion of current employment and selection as most important are both greater than the original percent of responses identifying having been employed a year or more in the position, namely nursing administrator or assistant, nursing instructor or assistant, and "other."

The fact that more respondents identified the position of clinical specialist as the most important they had ever held, than had identified having held such a position for a year or more, may be due to the fact that some of them may have held the position for less than a year. Question 24 did not set any time limit on the duration of employment in the position to be identified as the most important ever held.

---

*Detailed consideration is given to responses to Questions 20 and 23 part 3 in Chapter 4, Volume 1.

In interpreting the findings presented in Table Q 24 #2, the writers made the assumption that the importance of a nursing position, in the view of the respondent, could be determined as follows: an important position was one for which the proportion of respondents rating it as important was greater than the proportion identifying it as a position for a year or more and/or as a position held at the time of answering the questionnaire. On the basis of this criterion it was evident that

the positions ranking highest in importance in the opinion of respondents were instructor or assistant and clinical specialist.

Question 24 was not repeated on Q Two.

A comparison was made of responses to Question 24 by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 24 #3.

Table Q 24 #3. Percent of Responses for Most Important Position by Respondents' UTCN Program

Most Important Nursing Position	Total Population Responses N	Total Population Responses %	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
Staff or general duty nurse	189	40.9	181	45.6	8	12.3
Head nurse or assistant	65	14.1	61	15.6	4	6.2
Supervisor nurse or assistant	33	7.1	26	6.5	7	10.8
Nursing administrator or assistant	15	3.2	8	2.0	7	10.8
Nursing consultant	2	0.4	2	0.5	0	0
Nursing instructor or assistant	101	21.9	75	18.9	26	40.0
Nursing education administrator or assistant	12	2.6	6	1.5	6	9.2
Clinical specialist	14	3.0	12	3.0	2	3.1
Other	31	6.7	26	6.5	5	7.7
Total	462	99.9	397	100.1	65	100.1

The findings in Table Q 24 #3 should be considered in light of the fact that the high rating given to the importance of the staff or general duty nurse position by generic program as compared to registered nurse program respondents is influenced by the fact that approximately 50% of the generic program respondents, answering only two years after graduation, had had no other type of position. The registered nurse program respondents, however, had, in many cases, moved beyond the staff nurse position before entering UTCN and did not return to it after graduation with the baccalaureate degree.

CAREER SATISFACTIONS/DISSATISFACTIONS

Question 30: "In addition to the income received from employment, other reasons are frequently given for being employed. Please rank all the following reasons for your present employment in order of importance to you. Place a "1" by the most important, a "2" by the second most important, etc."

In Table Q 30 #1 the number and percent of responses for each option are recorded by ranks, first through sixth.

Table Q 30 #1. Reasons (Non–financial) for Present Employment Ranked for Importance

Reasons for Employment	Total Responses		Rank in Importance					
	Number	Percent	First		Second		Third	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Career commitment	318	16.1	36	11.3	45	14.2	55	17.3
Job satisfaction	353	17.9	74	21.0	94	26.6	96	27.2
The people I meet	327	16.6	9	2.8	28	8.6	37	11.3
Services to others	349	17.7	62	17.8	103	29.5	89	25.5
Personal fulfillment	356	18.0	171	48.0	90	25.3	57	16.0
Scholarship or Traineeship Commitment	270	13.7	10	3.7	2	0.7	9	3.3
Total	1973	100.0	362	AV 18.3	362	AV 18.3	343	AV 17.4

Reasons for Employment	Total Responses		Rank in Importance					
	Number	Percent	Fourth		Fifth		Sixth	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Career commitment	318	16.1	57	17.9	112	35.2	13	4.1
Job satisfaction	353	17.9	62	17.6	23	6.5	4	1.1
The people I meet	327	16.6	117	35.8	122	37.3	14	4.3
Services to others	349	17.7	58	16.6	33	9.5	4	1.1
Personal fulfillment	356	18.0	30	8.4	8	2.2	0	0
Scholarship or Traineeship Commitment	270	13.7	4	1.5	14	5.2	231	85.6
Total	1973	100.0	328	AV 16.6	312	AV 15.8	266	AV 13.5

A common base for comparing responses to Question 30 was developed by assigning values from 1 through 6 points to the rank of importance. First place was given a value of six points, second place a value of five points and so on down to sixth place which was given a value of one point.

The total points, percent of aggregate points and mean rank derived from each of the six options are presented in Table Q 30 #2.

Table Q 30 #2. Ranking of Reasons for Present Employment by Various Point Systems

Reasons given for being presently employed in nursing	Total Points	Percent of Aggregate Points	Mean Point Ranking
Personal fulfillment	1810	25.0	5.08
Job satisfaction	1534	21.2	4.35
Service to others	1487	20.6	4.26
Career commitment	1069	14.8	3.36
People I meet	951	13.2	2.90
Scholarship or traineeship commitment	377	5.2	1.39
Total	7228	100.0	

The percent of the aggregate score that is derived from each of the six options, by Class and by respondents' UTCN program is presented in Table A 6 Appendix.

Question 30 was not repeated on Q Two.

The findings presented for Question 30 indicated that

the three most frequently given reasons for being employed, beyond the monetary one, were found to be personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others in descending order of magnitude of ratings; this finding was consistent, no matter how the data were analyzed;

the ranking of the relative importance of the options is the same for respondents of the generic and registered nurse program groups;

the relative magnitude of the score of each of the three top choices, for the two program groups and for each option, is quite similar. (See Table A 6 Appendix)

A comparison was made of responses to a similar question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The findings in the Vanderbilt study were reported in terms of only the first choices as follows: The first choices recorded were for "service to others", "personal fulfillment" and "job satisfaction," each of which were selected by 25 percent. The remaining 25% of first choices were distributed among the other choices.

The findings presented in this comparison indicated that

respondents in the two studies provided relatively similar rankings; UTCN respondents ranked personal fulfillment as the most important, while rating service to others and job satisfaction as only slightly less important; the same three reasons for being employed were held to be the major ones in both studies.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. pg. 35

FEELINGS ABOUT NOT BEING EMPLOYED IN NURSING

Question 41 asked respondents who had indicated that they were not presently employed in nursing to identify the way they felt about it from among five options. They were asked to circle only one response.

There were 149 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 41 #1.

Table Q 41 #1. Percent of Responses for Feelings About not Being Employed in Nursing

Feelings About not Being Presently Employed in Nursing	Responses N	%
I wish I could be	69	46.3
I regret that I am not	31	20.8
I have no desire to be	23	15.4
I never think about it	16	10.7
I feel glad that I am not	10	6.7
Total	149	99.9

A comparison was made of the responses to an identical question that was answered by respondents in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The findings are presented in Table Q 41 #2.

Table Q 41 #2. Percent Response for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents

Feelings About not Being Employed at Present in Nursing	Vanderbilt Responses N	%	UTCN Responses N	%
"I wish I could be," "I regret that I am not"	170	53.0	100	67.0
"I have no desire to be," "I am glad I am not"	108	26.0	33	22.0
"I never think about it"	54	17.0	16	11.0
Total	332	96.0	149	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 41 #2 indicated that

respondents in the UTCN study expressed a somewhat more positive feeling about their desire to be employed in nursing than did the respondents in the Vanderbilt study.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p36

A comparison was made of the responses from two graduation–response interval groups of respondents. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 41 #3.

Table Q 41 #3. Percent of Responses for Feelings About not Being Employed in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Graduation –Response Interval in Years	Regret I am not Responses N	%	Wish I could be Responses N	%	Feel glad I am not Responses N	%	No desire to be Responses N	%	Never think about it Responses N	%
3–13	23	20.4	54	47.8	3	2.7	18	15.9	15	13.3
2	8	22.2	15	41.7	7	19.4	5	13.9	1	2.8

No comparison was made between the responses recorded by the generic and registered nurse program respondents because of the small number (N=12) of the latter who were not employed when they answered Q One.

Question 41 was not repeated on Q Two.

The findings presented for Question 41 indicated that

positive feelings about being employed in nursing expressed in the two responses, "I regret that I am not" employed in nursing and "I wish I could be," outweigh negative and neutral feelings 2 to 1;

the proportion of respondents expressing these positive feelings was very similar regardless of the length of the graduation–response interval; the same was true of the proportion expressing the negative feeling, "No desire to be employed" in the two graduation–response interval groups;

there was a considerable difference, however, in the proportion of responses for "I feel glad I am not" employed and "Never think about it"; as would be expected, respondents who answered 3 to 13 years after graduation were less likely to have given thought to the fact that they were not employed in nursing than were those just 2 years out of school; a greater proportion of the more recent graduates, compared to those out of school for 3 to 13 years, indicated "I feel glad I am not" employed at present in nursing; this suggests an alternate significant commitment such as one to raising a family (see findings for Question 40, Chapter 5, Non–Employment, Volume 1);

when the responses for the neutral option, "Never think about it", are eliminated from the findings for both groups, the proportion of responses expressing a positive feeling about employment in nursing is considerably greater among respondents 3 to 13 years out of school who were not presently employed than it was among those 2 years out of school and not employed.

Question 42: "Have any of the following made you feel "uncomfortable" for not being active in nursing?" (Circle one)

There were 157 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 42 #1.

Table Q 42 #1. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing

Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing	Response N	Response %
Never felt "uncomfortable"	85	54.1
My own personal feelings	54	34.4
Other nurses who were employed	12	7.6
People outside the profession	4	2.5
Classmates	2	1.3
College of Nursing alumnae	0	0.0
College of Nursing faculty	0	0.0
Total	157	99.9

A comparison was made between these responses and those recorded for a similar question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The findings for this comparison are presented in Table Q 42 #2.

Table Q 42 #2. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents

Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable About Not Being Active in Nursing	Vanderbilt Response N = 324 %	UTCN Responses N = 57 %
I never felt "uncomfortable"	74	54
My own personal feelings	22	34
All other reasons	4	12
Total	100	100

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p 36

The findings of this comparison indicated that

in general, the feelings of the respondents from the two universities were similar in the way the responses were distributed;

the UTCN respondents recorded more feelings of being "uncomfortable" because they were not employed in nursing, and for a greater variety of reasons, than did the Vanderbilt respondents.

A comparison was made of the responses from two graduation–response interval groups of respondents. The findings from this comparison are presented in Table Q 42 #3.

Table Q 42 #3. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing	Graduation–Response Intervals 3–13 years Responses N	%	2 years Responses N	%
Never felt uncomfortable	67	56.3	18	47.4
My personal feelings	36	30.3	18	47.4
Other nurses who are employed	11	9.2	1	2.6
People outside the profession	3	2.5	1	2.6
Classmates	2	1.7	0	0.0
UTCN faculty	0	0.0	0	0.0
UTCN alumnae	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	119	100.0	38	100.0

No comparison was made between the responses recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents because of the small number (N=14) of the latter who were not employed.

Question 42 was not repeated on Q Two.

The findings presented in Tables Q 42 #1 and # 3 indicated that

the more recently graduated respondents recorded a higher level of feeling uncomfortable about not being employed than did respondents who were out of school longer;

however, respondents 3–13 years out of school experienced discomfort more frequently than did those in the 2 year group, as a result of their perception of the opinions of other nurses who were employed concerning the fact that they, themselves, were not employed;

the principal cause of discomfort in this regard, for those in the 2 year group, was their personal feelings about what was right for them.

Question 59: "How attractive does work in nursing today seem to you, compared with work in other fields? (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 59 #1.

Table Q 59 #1. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Responses N	%
More attractive	185	35.2
About the same	137	26.2
Less attractive	97	18.5
Much more attractive	87	16.6
Much less attractive	19	3.6
Total	525	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses recorded by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 59 #2.

Table Q 59 #2. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared with Other Fields	Total Population Responses N	%	Graduates Classes 1954–1964 Responses N	%	Graduates Classes 1965–1974 Responses N	%
Much less attractive	19	3.6	8	3.3	11	3.9
Less attractive	97	18.5	43	17.7	54	19.1
About the same	137	26.2	77	31.7	60	21.3
More attractive	185	35.2	86	35.4	99	35.1
Much more attractive	87	16.6	29	11.9	58	20.6
Total	525	100.0	243	100.0	282	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses recorded by respondents in the generic and registered nurse program groups. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 59 #3.

Table Q 59 #3. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Much less attractive	19	3.6	18	4.0	1	1.3
Less attractive	97	18.5	81	18.0	16	21.3
About the same	137	26.1	119	26.4	18	24.0
More attractive	185	35.2	157	34.9	28	37.3
Much more attractive	87	16.6	75	16.7	12	16.0
Total	525	100.0	450	100.0	75	99.9

Question 59 was repeated unchanged on Q Two. There were 242 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 59 #4.

Table Q 59 #4. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q Two

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Responses N	%
Much less attractive	6	2.5
Less attractive	37	15.3
About the same	71	29.3
More attractive	90	37.2
Much more attractive	38	15.7
Total	242	100.0

A comparison was made between the responses to Question 59 Q One and Question 28 Q Two. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 59 #5.

Table Q 59 #5. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q One and Q Two

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared with other fields	Q One N = 525 Responses %	Q Two N = 242 Responses %
Much less attractive	3.6	2.5
Less attractive	18.5	15.3
About the same	26.2	29.3
More attractive	35.2	37.2
Much more attractive	16.6	15.7
Total	100.1	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 28 Q Two by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 59 #6

Table Q 59 #6. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Much less attractive	6	2.5	6	2.8	0	0.0
Less attractive	37	15.3	33	15.5	4	13.8
About the same	71	29.3	63	29.6	8	27.6
More attractive	90	37.2	81	38.0	9	31.0
Much more attractive	38	15.7	30	14.1	8	27.6
Total	242	100.0	213	100.0	29	100.0

Responses recorded by respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Question 59 Q One and Question 28 Q Two are presented in Table Q 59 #7.

Table Q 59 #7. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields for Two–Year Seven Year Samples

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared with Other Fields	Questionnaire One Responses N	%	Questionnaire Two Responses N	%
Much less attractive	1	1.1	3	3.3
Less attractive	30	32.3	21	22.8
About the same	21	22.6	24	26.1
More attractive	30	32.3	34	37.0
Much more attractive	11	11.8	10	10.9
Total	93	100.1	92	100.1

The findings presented in Tables Q 59 #1 through #7 indicated that

the pattern of responses for the total population did not vary by more than 3 percentage points between Q One and Q Two category responses;

the same was the case for responses of the generic and registered nurse program respondents on Q One;

the pattern of responses for the total population, by two graduation–response intervals was similar with two exceptions; 10% more of the responses were recorded for "much more attractive" by respondents who answered 2 years after graduation, while the reverse was true in the case of the option "about the same;" two factors that may have influenced these attitudes are: conditions existing in nursing and other fields may have been different in 1967 when the 3–13 year respondents answered and in the period 1968–1976 when the 2 year group answered and the longer period of time since graduation in which to accumulate experience may have influenced attitudes;

evidence of another difference in feelings about the attractiveness of nursing emerged when responses from generic and registered nurse program groups on Q Two were compared; a considerably higher proportion of responses for the "much more attractive" option was recorded by the registered nurse program respondents than by the generic program respondents;

overall, there seemed to be a tendency toward more positive feelings about the attractivness of nursing, compared to other fields, related to the recency of graduation and the shorter graduation–response interval

RECONSIDERATION OF CAREER CHOICE

Question 60: "Knowing what you know now, do you think you would choose a career in nursing if you had to make the choice again? (Circle one)."

There were 527 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 60 #1.

Table Q 60 #1. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Responses N	%
Definitely no	13	2.5
Probably no	76	14.4
Probably yes	192	36.4
Definitely yes	246	46.7
Total	527	100.0

The findings in the Vanderbilt[1] study on this subject were similar, namely, "81% of 676 respondents stated they definitely would or probably would choose nursing as a career again, given the opportunity."

A comparison was made of the responses made by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after. The findings are presented in Table Q 60 #2.

Table Q 60 #2. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Total Population Responses N	%	Graduates Classes 1954–1964 Responses N	%	Graduates Classes 1965–1974 Responses N	%
Definitely no	13	2.5	7	2.9	6	2.1
Probably no	76	14.4	33	13.5	43	15.2
Probably yes	192	36.4	90	36.9	102	36.0
Definitely yes	246	46.7	114	46.7	132	46.6
Total	527	100.0	244	100.0	283	99.9

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p 48

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 60 that were made by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #3.

Table Q 60 #3. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Definitely no	13	2.5	9	2.0	4	5.3
Probably no	76	14.4	65	14.4	11	14.5
Probably yes	192	36.4	164	36.4	28	36.8
Definitely yes	246	46.7	213	47.2	33	43.4
Total	527	100.0	451	100.0	76	100.0

Question 60 was repeated unchanged as Question 29 on Q Two. There were 244 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 60 #4.

Table Q 60 #4. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career, Q Two

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Responses	
	N	%
Definitely no	3	1.2
Probably no	35	14.3
Probably yes	98	40.2
Definitely yes	108	44.3
Total	244	100.0

A comparison was made between the responses to Question 60 Q One and Question 29 Q Two. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #5.

Table Q 60 #5. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career by Q One and Q Two

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Q One N = 527 Responses %	Q Two N = 244 Responses %
Definitely no	2.5	1.2
Probably no	14.4	14.3
Probably yes	36.4	40.2
Definitely yes	46.7	44.3
Total	100.0	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 29 Q Two recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #6.

Table Q 60 #6. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program. Q Two

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Total Population Responses		Generic Graduates Responses		Registered Nurse Graduates Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Definitely no	3	1.2	3	1.4	0	0.0
Probably no	35	14.3	29	13.5	6	20.7
Probably yes	98	40.2	88	40.9	10	34.5
Definitely yes	108	44.3	95	44.2	13	44.8
Total	244	100.0	215	100.0	29	100.0

The respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample are included in the total population and no additional, meaningful findings were obtained from the analysis of their responses.

The findings presented in Tables Q 60 #1 through #6 indicated that

regardless of the way in which the responses were analyzed, the likelihood of respondents thinking that they would choose nursing again on the basis of present knowledge, was consistently 80% or better; it was noted that the lowest percents for likelihood were obtained from the smaller samples;

the 17% of the 527 respondents in the total population who would probably and/or definitely not choose nursing again, suggested a level of dissatisfaction and/or disillusionment that, the writers believe, should be addressed; although it may reflect a situation that is no worse than that in other professions, it still represents a significant factor in the cost benefit relationships of nursing education; the existance of this group has been considered and measures to reduce its numbers have been proposed in Reality Shock by Marlene Kramer.

Question 30 Q Two does not have a counterpart on Q One. It was addressed to those respondents who indicated that, knowing what they presently knew, they either definitely or probably would not choose a career in nursing again.

Question 30 Q Two: "What general field of work would you choose now, if you had it to do again? (Circle one)."

There were 42* usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 60 #7.

Table Q 60 #7. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choice Q Two

Alternate Career Choice	Responses	
	N	%
Teaching	6	14.3
Business office	3	7.1
Social work	5	11.9
Medicine	9	21.4
Laboratory work	2	4.8
Other	17	40.5
Total	42	100.0

Respondents who indicated that their alternate career choice was in a field other than the five options listed, were asked to specify the field they preferred.

3 each identified art, including antiques and home economics, including interior design;
2 each identified occupational and/or physical therapy, psychology and linguistics and interpreting;
1 each identified veterinary medicine, dental hygeine, medical research, mathematics and pharmacy.

---

*This number exceeds the 38 respondents to Question 29 on Q Two to whom it was addressed. It appears that 4 respondents who answered Q Two, N= 244, but did not answer Question 29, did answer Question 30.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 30 Q Two by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #8.

Table Q 60 #8. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choices by Respondents' UTCN Program
Q Two

Alternate Career Choices	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching	6	14.3	5	13.9	1	16.7
Business Office	3	7.1	3	8.3	0	0.0
Social Work	5	11.9	5	13.9	0	0.0
Medicine	9	21.4	7	19.4	2	33.3
Laboratory Work	2	4.8	2	5.6	0	0.0
Other	17	40.5	14	38.9	3	50.0
Total	42	100.0	36	100.0	6	100.0

The findings presented in Tables Q 60 #7 and #8 and the listing of the responses to the "other" option indicated that

the majority of those respondents who felt they would have chosen a career other than nursing were, nevertheless, attracted to personal service fields.

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

Question 54: "How would you describe your husband's attitude toward your employment as a nurse? (Circle one)."

There were 314 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 54 #1.

Table Q 54 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse.

Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse	Responses N	%
Strongly favors it	114	36.3
Approves it	132	42.0
Is indifferent to it	19	6.1
Discourages it	36	11.5
Opposes it	13	4.1
Total	314	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses of those who answered 3–13 years after graduation and those who answered 2 years after graduation. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 54 #2.

Table Q 54 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Graduation Response Interval in years	Husband's Attitude Toward Respondents Employment as a Nurse					
	Strongly favors it Responses		Approves it Responses		Indifferent to it Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
3–13 N = 161	35	21.7	72	44.7	13	8.1
2 N = 153	79	51.6	60	39.2	6	3.9

Graduation Response Interval in years	Husband's Attitude Toward Respondents Employment as a Nurse			
	Discourages it Responses		Opposes it Responses	
	N	%	N	%
3–13 N = 161	28	17.4	13	8.1
2 N = 153	8	5.2	0	0.0

A comparison was made of the responses of the generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 54 #3.

Table Q 54 #3. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondents' Employment as a Nurse by Respondents' UTCN Program

Attitude of Husband Toward Respondents' Employment as a Nurse	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Strongly favors it	114	36.3	103	37.1	11	30.6
Approves it	132	42.0	114	41.0	18	50.0
Is indifferent to it	19	6.1	16	5.8	3	8.3
Discourages it	36	11.5	34	12.2	2	5.6
Opposes it	13	4.1	11	4.0	2	5.6
Total	314	100.0	278	100.1	36	100.1

The same question concerning the husband's attitude was repeated on Q Two but it was directed only to those respondents who had married or remarried in the five year period since they answered Q One.

They were 22 usable responses from this group and they are presented in Table Q 54 #4.

Table Q 54 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse, for Respondents Married or Remarried Since Q One

Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse	Responses N	Responses %
Strongly favors it	8	36.4
Approves it	12	54.5
Is indifferent to it	0	0.0
Discourages it	2	9.1
Opposes it	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0

Question 25 on Q Two does not have a counterpart on Q One. It was addressed to those respondents who were married on Q Two and whose marital status was the same as it was when they answered Q One. These respondents were asked to answer "yes" or "no" to

Question 25: "Do you feel that your husband's attitude toward your employment in nursing has changed since you answered the previous questionnaire? (Circle one)."

There were 172 usable responses. 28, 16.3% were "yes" 144, 83.7% were "no".

Question 26 on Q Two does not have a counterpart on Q One. It asked the 28 respondents who answered "yes" to Question 25 to identify the nature of the change in the attitude of the husband. The 28 responses are presented in Table Q 54 #5.

Tables Q 54 #5. Percent of Responses for Type of Change in Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse Since Q One

Change in Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse	Responses N	Responses %
From favorable to unfavorable	11	39.3
From unfavorable to favorable	9	32.1
From indifferent to favorable	6	21.4
From indifferent to unfavorable	2	7.1
Total	28	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 54 #1 through #5 indicated that

respondents in the total married population and those in both subgroups on the basis of program reported close to a 4 to 1 ratio for favorable attitudes on the part of the husband toward the respondent's employment as a nurse;

in the total population, for respondents 2 years out of school, the favorable ratio was 9 to 1;

for the small group (N=28) who reported a change in attitude on the part of husbands during the interval between Q One and Q Two, a slightly higher proportion, 53.5% reported that the change was from indifferent and unfavorable to favorable than reported that the change was from indifferent and favorable to unfavorable attitudes;

the longer the graduation–response interval, the greater the likelihood of an unfavorable attitude on the part of the husband.

The writers postulated that the previously established four year break point in employment rate (see Question 12, Chapter 3, Volume 1.) and the increase in unfavorable attitudes on the part of husbands occurring between 2 and 7 years after graduation, were related.

LASTING FRIENDSHIPS AMONG RESPONDENTS

Question 56: "How many students, who attended The University of Tennessee Nursing program(s) when you did, do you count as among your friends in terms of keeping in touch with them? (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 56 #1.

Table Q 56 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are Now Friends

Number of Fellow Students Counted as Friends	Responses N	Responses %
Eight or more	90	17.1
Three	76	14.5
Four	73	13.9
Five	73	13.9
Two	68	13.0
Six	47	9.0
One	43	8.2
None	29	5.5
Seven	26	5.0
Total	525	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses of generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 56 #2.

Table Q 56 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are now Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program

Member of Former Fellow Students Counted Among Friends	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
One	43	8.2	31	6.9	12	16.0
Two	68	13.0	59	13.1	9	12.0
Three	76	14.5	62	13.8	14	18.7
Four	73	13.9	59	13.1	14	18.7
Five	73	13.9	65	14.4	8	10.7
Six	47	9.0	42	9.3	5	6.7
Seven	26	5.0	25	5.6	1	1.3
Eight or more	90	17.1	87	19.3	3	4.0
None	29	5.5	20	4.5	9	12.0
Total	525	100.1	450	100.0	75	100.1

The responses to Question 56 were analyzed further to determine the mean number of friends reported per respondent. The findings of this analysis are presented in Table Q 56 #3.

Table Q 56 #3. Mean Number of Fellow Students Counted as Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class

Class	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Respondents N	Mean Number of Reported Friends	Respondents N	Mean Number of Reported Friends
1954	20	5.2	3	2.7
1955	16	6.7	3	7.3
1956	31	6.3	1	1.0
1957	23	6.3	4	3.0
1958	26	5.5	8	3.8
1959	17	4.9	3	4.3
1960	18	6.2	2	1.5
1961	17	5.2	4	4.3
1962	21	5.8	1	5.0
1963	6	4.2	1	1.0
1964	15	3.3	5	5.0
1965	15	5.5	4	4.5
1966	22	6.1	6	3.7
1967	12	5.7	0	0.0
1968	34	5.3	3	4.7
1969	26	6.4	4	6.0
1970	35	4.8	1	4.0
1971	24	3.7	8	4.4
1972	19	5.8	3	3.7
1973	20	4.9	3	3.3
1974	33	5.7	8	3.6
Total	450	AV5.5	75	AV4.1

The findings for responses to Question 56 indicated that

respondents in the generic program group averaged between four and five (range from two to six) of their fellow students counted as friends at the time they answered Q One; there was no significant difference in the number for those who responded 3–13 years after graduation (mean 5.6) and those who responded 2 years after graduation (mean 5.4);

respondents in the registered nurse program group averaged three of their fellow students (range from none to six) counted as friends at the time they answered Q One; there was no significant difference in the number for those who responded 3–13 years after graduation (mean 3.9) and those who responded 2 years after graduation (mean 4.2); the comparatively small number of registered nurse program respondents in each Class may have had bearing on these findings; it would imply that these respondents may have made friends among the members of their own small group rather than among members of the generic program group as well.

In the opinion of the writers, the estimated average number of classmates, 4.28, who were counted as friends would appear to be relatively high considering mobility, marriage and length of the graduation–responses interval. However, it appeared to give credence to the traditional wisdom among nurses that relatively numerous and long–lasting friendships are established among students during the time they are living, studying and working together in schools of nursing.

CHAPTER 4

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

The subjects of professional and community activities of respondents are addressed next in this study.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Question 61: "Have you ever been a member of the American Nurses' Association? (Circle one)."

There were 532 usable responses and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 61 #1.

Table Q 61 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options

ANA Membership Status	Responses N	Responses %
Yes, currently	203	38.2
Yes, not currently	174	32.7
No	155	29.1
Total	532	100.0

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for ANA membership status by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 61 #2.

Table Q 61 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

ANA Membership Status	Total Population Responses N	Total Population Responses %	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
A member currently	203	38.2	154	33.8	49	64.5
A member at one time, not currently	174	32.7	154	33.8	20	26.3
Never a member	155	29.1	148	32.5	7	9.2
Total	532	100.0	456	100.1	76	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses to similar questions in the Vanderbilt [1] and NLN[2] studies and those in the UTCN study.

The Vanderbilt study reported 22% of 715 respondents (including all programs) were currently members of ANA when they provided the information in 1963. The UTCN finding of 38.2% (Table Q 61 #1) compares favorably with this Vanderbilt finding.

The NLN study reported 26.8% of 1650 baccalaureate graduates were members of ANA when they were questioned five years after graduation. The UTCN findings of 24.4% of the 213 generic program respondents who answered Q One 3-13 years after graduation and 28.6% for the 21 generic program respondents in the Class of 1962 who answered Q One five years after graduation (Table A 7, Appendix) are similar to the NLN study findings.

The findings derived from responses to Question 61 indicated that

an equal proportion of the generic program respondents had never been members, had at one time been members and were currently members of ANA when they answered Q One;

these proportions varied, however, when the graduation-response interval was taken into consideration; approximately half of the generic program respondents, 3-13 years out of school, reported having been members of ANA at one time while the remaining half were equally divided between those who had never been members and those who were currently members; less than one fifth of those responding after 2 years out of school reported having been members of ANA at one time and the remaining four fifths were divided almost equally between those who were currently members and those who had never been members;

when the responses for current and previous membership in ANA were compared with those for no membership, the ratio for the generic program respondents as a whole was 2 to 1; for the 3-13 year group it was 3 to 1; for the 2 year group it was 1.5 to 1;

registered nurse program respondents recorded a considerably higher ratio of members to non-members in ANA than did the generic program respondents; the ratio was 9 to 1 for the group as a whole, 9.3 to 0.3 for the 3-13 year group and 8.5 to 1.5 for the 2 year group;

this higher level of membership in ANA among registered nurse program respondents was interpreted as another indication of professional behavior (see their pursuit of graduate education, Chapter 2, Volume 1) that was more evident among them than among generic program respondents.

The percent of responses for 3 ANA membership options, by respondents' UTCN program, by 2 graudation-response intervals and by Class is presented in Table A 7 Appendix.

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p.44

[2] Knopf, L., RN's One and Five Years After Graduation Table 35, p. 35

Question 62: "Which of the following best describes the greatest degree of you participation in the American Nurses' Association on the local, state and national level? (Circle one in each column)."

There were 362 responses recorded for participation at the local, state and national levels. It was apparent that not all the 377 respondents, who recorded in Question 61 that they had been members at some time, responded to Question 62. The responses are presented in Table Q 62 #1.

Table Q 62 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation.

Degrees of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	38	10.5	14	3.9	2	0.6
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	81	22.4	41	11.3	8	2.2
Minimal: pay dues occasionally attend meetings	243	67.1	307	84.8	352	97.2
Total	362	100.0	362	100.0	362	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses of the generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 62 #2.

Table Q 62 #2. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and by Respondents' UTCN Program.

	Generic Program Respondents					
Degrees of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	25	8.5	7	2.4	2	0.7
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	59	20.1	25	8;5	3	1.0
Minimal: pay dues occasionally attend meetings	209	71.3	261	89.1	288	98.3
Total	293	99.9	293	100.0	293	100.0

	Registered Nurse Program Respondents					
Degrees of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	13	18.8	7	10.1	0	0
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	22	31.9	16	23.2	5	7.2
Minimal: pay dues occasionally attend meetings	34	49.3	46	66.7	64	92.8
Total	69	100.0	69	100.0	69	100.0

The responses for Question 62 were further analyzed by assigning values to the degrees of participation ranging from 3 points for leadership participation responses down to 1 point for minimal participation responses. The findings of this analysis, based on the point system, by respondents' UTCN Program and by Class, are presented in Tables A 8 and A 9 Appendix.

A summary of the findings in Tables A 8 and A 9 is presented in Summary Table Q 62 #3.

Summary Table Q 62 #3. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation, by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals.

			Local Association					
			Leadership (3 points)		Active (2 points)		Minimal (1 point)	
Generic Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	293	402	75	18.7	118	29.4	209	52.0
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	152	227	60	26.4	70	30.8	97	42.7
G – R Interval 2 years	141	175	15	8.6	48	27.4	112	64.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	69	117	39	33.3	44	37.6	34	29.1
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	34	70	36	51.4	24	34.3	10	14.3
G – R Interval 2 years	35	47	3	6.4	20	42.6	24	51.1

Summary Table Q 62 #3 continued.

			State Association					
			Leadership (3 points)		Active (2 points)		Minimal (1 point)	
Generic Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	293	332	21	6.3	50	15.1	261	78.9
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	152	183	15	8.2	34	18.6	130	71.1
G – R Interval 2 years	141	153	6	3.9	16	10.5	131	85.6
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	69	99	21	21.2	32	32.3	46	46.5
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	34	57	18	31.6	22	38.6	17	29.8
G – R Interval 2 years	35	42	3	7.1	10	23.8	29	69.0

Summary Table Q 62 #3 continued.

			National Association					
Generic Program	N	Pts	Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	293	300	3	2.0	6	2.0	289	96.0
G–R Interval 3 – 13 years	152	157	3	1.9	6	3.8	148	94.3
G–R Interval 2 years	141	141	0	0.0	6	0.0	141	100.0

Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	69	74	0	0.0	10	14.5	64	86.5
G–R Interval 3 – 13 years	34	38	0	0.0	8	21.1	30	78.9
G–R Interval 2 years	35	36	0	0.0	2	5.6	34	94.4

The findings in Table Q 62 #2 and Summary Table Q 62 #3 indicated that

in addition to reporting a higher rate of membership, the registered nurse program respondents reported a higher degree of participation in ANA activities than did generic program respondents;

as was to be expected, at local, state and national levels of the organization, the longer the graduation-response interval, the greater was the degree of participation as leaders and active members by respondents in both programs.

The findings of the Vanderbilt[1] study on the subject of the degree of participation in ANA could not be compared meaningfully with the UTCN findings because of differences in categories of participation and method of reporting.

Question 62 was not repeated on Q Two. However it was possible to tabulate some information concerning activity of respondents in the American Nurses' Association during the five year period covered in Q Two from responses to Question 31, Q Two.

Question 31 asked respondents to "List the elective offices and committee positions you have held in professional organizations for the period of time covered in this questionnaire."

There were 31 responses that were identified as related to the local level of ANA, 13 that were related to the state level and 1 response was related to the national level of ANA. These were distributed between the two degrees of participation, leadership participation and active participation. The wording of Question 31 ruled out responses at the minimal level since it asked only for elected offices and appointed committee positions. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table Q 62 #4.

Table Q 62 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two.

Degree of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	21	67.7	7	53.8	1	100
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	10	32.3	6	46.2	0	0.0
Total	31	100.0	13	100.0	1	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 62 #4 indicated that

the participation rate, beyond minimal membership, of this group, 18.1% of 249 respondents to Q Two, was noticeably less than that for the total population on Q One, 34.5% of 533 respondents; since the writers have already made the point that the Q Two population was a representative sample of the Q One population, the most parsimonious interpretation of this finding was that there was a proportional decrease in active and leadership participation in ANA with the passage of time.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 46

Question 63: "Have you ever been a member of the National League for Nursing (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 63 #1.

Table Q 63 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options.

NLN Membership Status	Responses N	%
Yes, currently	50	9.5
Yes, not currently	80	15.2
No	395	75.2
Total	525	99.9

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for NLN membership status by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 63 #2.

Table Q 63 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

NLN Membership Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A member currently	50	9.5	28	6.2	22	29.3
A member at one time, not currently	80	15.2	64	14.2	16	21.3
Never a member	395	75.2	358	79.6	37	49.3
Total	525	99.9	450	100.0	75	99.9

A comparison was made of responses in the Vanderbilt[1] and the NLN[2] study with those in the UTCN study.

The Vanderbilt study reported 18% of 715 respondents (including all programs) were currently members of the NLN when they provided the information in 1963. The UTCN finding of 9.5% (Table Q 63 #1) does not compare favorably with the Vanderbilt finding.

The NLN study reported 3.2% of 1650 baccalaureate graduates were members of NLN when they were questioned five years after graduation. The UTCN findings of 12.0% of 208 generic program respondents who answered Q One from 3-13 years after graduation and 14.3% of the 21 generic program respondents in the Class of 1962 who answered Q One five years after graduation (Table A 10 Appendix) compare favorably with the NLN study findings.

The percent of responses for 3 NLN membership options, by the respondents' UTCN program, by 2 graduation-response intervals and by Class is presented in Table A 10 Appendix.

The findings derived from responses to Question 63 indicated that

a considerably higher proportion of generic program respondents had never been members of NLN than was the case for registered nurse program respondents;

registered nurse program respondents showed higher proportions of responses for current membership among both the 3-13 and the 2 year graduation-response interval groups than did the generic program respondents;

the longer graduation-response interval was related positively to increased NLN membership in both program groups. The writers believed that the rate of membership in the NLN is higher among nurses employed in nursing education than among those otherwise employed and they postulated that there was a positive relationship between these NLN membership findings and findings recorded for Question 18, Q One concerning employers reported 3-13 years after graduation (Table Q 18 #4, Chapter 4, Volume 1).

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 44

[2] Knopf, L., RNs One and Five Years After Graduation Table 35 p. 35.

Question 64: "Which of the following best describes the greatest degree of your participation in the National League for Nursing? (Circle one number in each column)."

There were 126 responses for participation at the local, state and national levels of NLN. It was apparent that almost but not all the 130 respondents who answered in Question 63 that they had been members at one time, responded to Question 64. The responses are presented in Table Q 64 #1.

Table Q 64 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation.

Degrees of Participation	Local League Responses N	Local League Responses %	State League Responses N	State League Responses %	National League Responses N	National League Responses %
Leadership: officer, committee chairman	19	15.0	11	8.7	1	0.8
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	26	20.6	20	15.9	5	4.0
Minimal: pary dues occasionally attend	81	64.3	95	75.4	120	95.2
Total	126	99.9	126	100.0	126	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 64 #1 indicated that

82 respondents, 15.4% of the total N of respondents to Q One, indicated that their degree of participation in NLN was above the minimal.

A comparison was made of responses indicating the degree of participation in NLN recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 64 #2.

Table Q 64 #2 Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and Respondents' UTCN Program.

	Generic Program					
Degree of Participation	Local League Responses		State League Responses		National League Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer, committee chairman	7	7.9	5	5.6	1	1.1
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	17	19.1	9	10.1	2	2.2
Minimal: pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	65	73.0	75	84.3	86	96.6
Total	89	100.0	89	100.0	89	99.9

	Registered Nurse Program					
Degree of Participation	Local League Responses		State League Responses		National League Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer, committee chairman	12	32.4	6	16.2	0	0
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	9	24.3	11	29.7	3	8.1
Minimal: pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	16	43.2	20	54.1	34	91.9
Total	37	99.9	37	100.0	37	100.0

The findings for Question 64 were analyzed further by assigning values to the degrees of participation ranging from 3 points for leadership participation responses down to 1 point for minimal participation responses. The findings of this analysis, based on the point system, by respondents' UTCN program and by Class are presented in Tables A11 and A12 Appendix.

A summary of the findings presented in Tables A11 and A12 is presented in Summary Table Q 64 #3.

Summary Table Q 64 #3. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Level by 3 Degrees of Participation, by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation-Response Intervals.

			Local League					
			Leadership (3 points)		Active (2 points)		Minimal (1 point)	
Generic Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	89	120	21	17.5	34	28.3	65	54.2
G – R Interval 3 - 13 Years	70	100	21	21.0	32	32.0	47	47.0
G – R Interval 2 years	19	20	0	0.0	2	10.0	18	90.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	37	70	36	51.4	18	25.7	16	22.9
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	26	58	36	62.1	16	27.6	6	10.3
G – R Interval 2 years	11	12	0	0.0	2	16.7	10	83.3

Summary Table Q 64 #3 continued.

			State League					
Generic Program	N	Pts	Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	89	108	15	13.9	18	16.7	75	69.4
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	70	89	15	16.9	18	20.2	56	62.9
G – R Interval 2 years	19	19	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	100.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	37	60	18	30.0	22	36.7	20	33.3
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	26	49	18	36.7	22	44.9	9	18.4
G – R Interval 2 years	11	11	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	100.0

Summary Table Q 64 #3 continued.

			National League					
Generic Program	N	Pts	Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	89	93	3	3.2	4	4.3	86	92.5
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	70	74	3	41	4	5.4	67	94.4
G – R Interval 2 years	19	19	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	100.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	37	40	0	0.0	6	15.0	34	85.0
G – R Interval 3 - 13 Years	26	29	0	0.0	6	20.7	23	79.3
G - R Interval 2 years	11	11	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	100.0

The findings in Table Q 64 #3 indicated that

the same pattern of degrees of participation that was evident in relation to membership in ANA was evident again in the NLN findings;

the registered nurse program respondents were active to a greater degree proportionately and, again, they were more active in the local and state leagues; this was true, in particular, for the registered nurse program respondents in the 3-13 year graudation-response interval group.

Unfortunately the findings of the Vanderbilt[1] study on the subject of the degree of participation in NLN could not be compared with the UTCN findings because of differences in categories of participation and method of reporting.

Question 64 was not repeated on Questionnaire Two. Please see the discussion of Question 62 for the description of the use of appropriate responses recorded for Question 31 Q Two.

There were 7 responses that were identified as related to the local league, 7 responses related to the state league and 1 response related to the National League for Nursing. These were distributed between two degrees of participation, leadership participation and active participation, due to the wording of Question 31 Q Two. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table Q 64 #4.

Table Q 64 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two.

Degree of Participation	Local League Responses N	%	State League Responses N	%	National League Responses N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	4	57.1	4	57.1	0	0.0
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	100.0
Total	7	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 64 #4 indicated that

the participation rate, beyond minimal membership, of this small group (6.0%) of the 249 respondents to Q Two, was noticeably less than that for the total population of Q One (15.4%) of 533 respondents; the pattern here was similar to that of ANA participation.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 46

Question 65: "Have you ever been a member of any professional organization(s) other than the American Nurses' Assoication and the National League for Nursing? example: National Education Assoication, American Hosptial Association, American Public Health Association. (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 65 #1.

Table Q 65 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Membership in Other Professional Organizations.

Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations	Responses #	%
No, none	406	77.3
Yes, one	85	16.2
Yes, two	27	5.1
Yes, three	5	1.0
Yes, four or more	2	0.4
Total	525	100.0

The five respondents who recorded that they were members of three additional professional organizations were found, one each, in the Classes that graduated in 1955, 1956, 1958, 1969 and 1974. The latter two were registered nurse program respondents.

The two respondents who recorded that they were members of four or more additional professional organizations were found, one each, in the Classes of 1956 and 1959.

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for number of memberships in other professional organizations by respondents' UTCN program. The findings are presented in Table Q 65 #2.

Table Q 65 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	85	16.2	70	15.5	15	20.3
Two	27	5.1	18	4.0	9	12.2
Three	5	1.0	3	0.7	2	2.7
Four or more	2	0.4	0	0.0	2	2.7
None	406	77.3	360	79.8	46	62.2
Total	525	100.0	451	100.0	74	100.1

The findings presented in Table Q 65 #2 indicated that

the proportion of the registered nurse program respondents that reported membership in other professional organizations was higher by 15 percentage points than that reported by generic program respondents.

The percent of responses for the two options, membership in one and membership in two other professional organizations were combined and they are presented, by Class in Table Q 65 #3.

Table Q 65 #3. Percent of Responses for One and Two Memberships in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation-Response Intervals and by Class.

Class	G–R Int. years	Generic Program Respondents N	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Respondents N	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
1954	13	20	1	5.0	3	2	66.7
1955	12	17	3	17.6	3	1	33.3
1956	11	31	11	35.5	1	0	0.0
1957	10	23	5	21.7	3	2	66.7
1958	9	27	6	22.2	8	5	62.5
1959	8	17	4	23.5	3	1	33.3
1960	7	18	2	11.1	2	2	100.0
1961	6	17	2	11.8	4	4	100.0
1962	5	21	6	28.6	1	0	0.0
1963	4	5	1	20.0	1	0	0.0
1964	3	13	1	7.7	5	0	0.0
1965	2	16	3	18.8	4	1	25.0
1966	2	22	3	13.6	6	0	0.0
1967	2	12	3	25.0	0	0	0.0
1968	2	34	4	11.7	3	0	0.0
1969	2	26	4	15.4	5	0	0.0
1970	2	36	9	25.0	1	0	0.0
1971	2	24	8	33.3	8	1	12.5
1972	2	19	4	21.1	3	3	100.0
1973	2	21	3	14.3	2	1	50.0
1974	2	32	5	15.6	8	1	12.5
		451	88	mean 19.0 of percents	74	24	mean 31.5 of percents
Graduation–Response Intervals							
3 - 13 years		309	42	mean 18.6 of percent		17	mean 42.0 of percent
2 years		242	46	mean 19.3 of percent		7	mean 21.0 of percent

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for a similar question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The N on which the Vanderbilt findings were based was 693 and the stipulation was that the membership was current at the time of reporting. The findings were reported as follows; "Additional professional membership were reported by 28 percent (197) of the respondents, 59 percent (117) of these reported one membership."

The findings were compared with UTCN findings that 22.7 percent (119) of the respondents reported additional memberships and 71.4 percent (85) of these reported only one additional membership.

The conclusion drawn was that

UTCN respondents, although they reported on memberships over the total graduation-response interval, were less likely to have been members of professional organizations other than ANA and NLN and that the number of these organizations in which they had held memberships was fewer for them than for Vanderbilt respondents.

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for a similar question in the NLN[2] study. The UTCN finding of 20.2% (91) of the 451 generic program respondents reporting membership in one to three other professional organizations compared favorably with the NLN finding of 11.9%. The UTCN finding of 28.6% (9) of the generic program respondents in the Class of 1962 who answered Q One five years after graduation is based on so small a sample that it is not representative of even the 3-13 year graduation-response interval group on this subject.

Question 66: "Which of the following activities best exemplifies the greatest degree of your participation in the groups listed in Question 65? (Circle one)."

There were 123 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 66 #1.

Table Q 66 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations.

Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations	Responses N	%
Leadership participation, e.g. officer, committee chairman	11	8.9
Active participation, e.g. attend meetings, serve on committees	28	22.7
Minimal participation, e.g. pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	84	68.3
Total	123	99.9

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 46

[2] Knopf, L. Table 35 p. 35

A comparison was made of the responses indicating degree of participation by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 66 #2.

Table Q 66 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership participation	11	8.9	7	7.4	4	14.3
Active participation	28	22.7	20	21.0	8	28.6
Minimal participation	84	68.3	68	71.6	16	57.1
Total	123	99.9	95	100.0	28	100.0

Question 66 was not repeated on Q Two. However, it was possible to identify some professional organizations other than ANA and NLN in which respondents had held membership during the five year period since they answered Q One by the responses they made to Question 31 on Q Two. Question 31 aksed respondents to "List the elective offices and committee positions you have held in professional organizations for the period of time covered in this questionnaire."

The findings were as follows: 3 respondents reported membership in the American Public Health Association; 2 reported membership in the School Nurses' Association and 1 reported membership in the Association of Nurse Anesthetists.

The findings presented in Table Q 66 #1 and #2 indicated that

the degree of participation in professional organizations other than ANA and NLN that respondents reported in Table Q 66 #1 closely resembled the degree of participation reported in Table Q 62 #1 for the total population in the local level of ANA;

again, registered nurse program respondents were active to a greater degree, proportionately, in the other professional organizations than were the generic program respondents.

A comparison as made of the degree of participation in other professional organizations reported in the UTCN and Vanderbilt[1] studies. The percent of responses for membership in other professional organizations was 28.4% for Vanderbilt and 23.1% for UTCN for the total population. The degree of participation of the 197 Vanderbilt respondents who reported membership in other professional organizations was reported as follows: "Sixty-four percent (125) of the 197 described their participation as active and leadership in nature."

Of the 123 UTCN respondents who recorded being members of other professional organizations, 31.7% (39) indicated that their participation fell in the leadership and active categories.

The conclusion drawn was that

UTCN respondents actively partipated to a lesser degree than did Vanderbilt respondents in professional organizations other than ANA and NLN.

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Question 68: "In how many voluntary health and welfare organizations do you currently participate? e.g. Cancer Society, Heart Association, hospital board, Mental Health Assoication, etc. (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 68 #1.

Table Q 68 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations	Responses N	%
One	93	17.5
Two	44	8.3
Three	11	2.1
Four or more	6	1.1
None	377	71.0
Total	531	100.0

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 46

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses indicating the number of voluntary health and welfare organizations respondents participated in by generic and registered nurse program. The findings are presented in Table Q 68 #2.

Table Q 68 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	93	17.5	79	17.4	14	18.4
Two	44	8.3	32	7.0	12	15.8
Three	11	2.1	9	2.0	2	2.6
Four and more	6	1.1	4	0.9	2	2.6
None	377	71.0	331	72.7	46	60.2
Total	531	100.0	455	100.0	76	99.9

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for an identical question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The N on which the findings were based was 693 and the stipulation was that the membership was current at the time of reporting. The findings were reported as follows: "Fifty-one percent (362) of the respondents reported current participation in voluntary health and welfare organizations. Twenty-seven percent (190) of the sample participated in two or more of this type of organization."

The Vanderbilt findings indicated a higher rate of participation than did the UTCN findings; twenty-nine percent (154) of the respondents reported current membership in voluntary health and welfare organizations and thirty-nine percent (61) of these respondents were members of two or more organizations of this type.

In the NLN[2] study an open ended question, addressed to respondents 5 years after graduation asked; "What activities related to the health field have you been engaged in during the past year?" The findings were that twenty-nine percent (482) baccalaureate program respondents had participated. This is comparable to the twenty-seven percent (124) of the UTCN generic program respondents reporting membership in one or more of these organizations. (Table Q 68 #2)

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 46

[2] Knopf, L. RNs Five Years After Graudation Table 36 p. 35

Question 68 was not repeated on Questionnaire Two. However, it was possible to tabulate some information concerning participation by respondents in voluntary health and welfare organizations, during the five year period since they answered Q One, from responses to Question 31 Q Two. Question 31 asked respondents to "List the elective offices and committee positions you have held in professional organizations for the time covered in this questionnaire." In addition to the information recorded about participation in professional organizations which has been reported in the discussions of Questions 62, 64 and 66, responses to Question 31 also included reports of participation in voluntary health and welfare organizations including those given as examples in Question 68.

The voluntary health and welfare organizations that were identified and the number of respondents who reported participating in each during this five year interval are as follows:

Number of Responses	Name of Organizations
1	American Cancer Society
2	American Heart Association
1	Mental Health Association
4	American Red Cross
1	County Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependency.
1	Tennessee Nurses' Association and Allied Groups and Government Relations Council.
1	South Central Comprehensive Health Planning Council
1	Committee on Health Manpower, Memphis and Midsouth Council for Comprehensive Health Planning.
1	Speech and Hearing Center
2	State or County Home Health Agency
1	Regional Health Education Center
1	Suicide Prevention Program
2	Regional Council on Nursing
1	Sheltered Workshop
1	Regional Center for the Healing Arts

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Question 69: "In how many other voluntary organizations, such as religious, political, civic or educational groups, etc., do you currently participate? (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 69 #1.

Table Q 69 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations	Responses N	%
One	171	32.2
Two	112	21.1
Three	45	8.5
Four or more	18	3.4
None	185	34.8
Total	531	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses for the number of memberships in voluntary community organizations by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 69 #2.

Table Q 69 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	171	32.2	147	32.3	24	31.6
Two	112	21.1	93	20.4	19	25.0
Three	45	8.5	38	8.4	7	9.2
Four and more	18	3.4	17	3.7	1	1.3
None	185	34.8	160	35.2	25	32.9
Total	531	100.0	455	100.0	76	100.0

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for an identical question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The N on which the findings were based was 639 and the stipulation was that the membership was current at the time of reporting. The findings were reported as follows: ". . . . 80 percent (567) currently participated in one or more voluntary organizations such as religious, political, civic or educational groups. Fifty-six percent (400) belonged to two or more."

These findings were compared with the UTCN findings that 65.2% (345) of respondents reported current participation in voluntary community organizations and 50.7% (175) of these respondents participated in two or more organizations.

These findings were not as disparate with the Vanderbilt findings as were the findings concerning participation in voluntary health and welfare organizations in the two studies (Question 68). Both Vanderbilt and UTCN respondents were more likely to participate in non-health related voluntary community organizations than in health related ones. This finding held for single as well as multiple memberships.

Question 69 was not repeated on Questionnaire Two. However, it was possible to tabulate some information concerning participation of respondents in voluntary community organizations during the five year period since they answered Q One from responses made to Question 31 Q Two. In addition to information recorded about participation in professional organizations and voluntary health and welfare organizations, responses to Question 31 also included information about participation in groups that can be described as voluntary community organizations.

The voluntary community organizations that were identified and the number of respondents that identified participation in them are as follows:

Number of Responses	Name of Organization
1	Association for Childhood Education
1	American Society of Training and Development
1	Reelfoot Rural Ministry.

Activities that respondents reported in response to Question 31 Q Two that did not fall into any of the categories dealt with in Questions 61 through 69 are presented here:

2	respondents reported that they had served on the Tennessee Board of Nursing
1	had served on the Committee of Deans and Directors of Schools of Nursing in Tennessee
11	has served as officers of the University of Tennessee Alumni Association and
1	had served on the Board of Directors of the University of Tennessee General Alumni Association and the Committee on Women's Activities of the General Alumni Association
4	had served on officers of the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 48

NURSING JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Question 70: "To how many nursing journals do you presently subscribe as an individual? Examples: American Journal of Nursing, Nursing Outlook, Nursing Science, Nursing Forum, Nursing Research, Nursing World, R.N., International Nursing Review, etc. (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 70 #1.

Table Q 70 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions.

Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions	Responses N	%
One	206	38.8
Two	86	16.2
Three or more	35	6.6
None	204	38.4
Total	531	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses for the number of nursing journal subscriptions by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 70 #2.

Table Q 70 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Nursing Journals Subscriptions	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
One	206	38.8	183	40.1	23	30.7
Two	86	16.2	60	13.2	26	34.7
Three or more	35	6.6	23	5.0	12	16.0
None	204	38.4	190	41.7	14	18.7
Total	531	100.0	456	100.0	75	100.1

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for one subscription and two and more subscriptions to nursing journals by generic and registered nurse program respondents and by Class. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 70 #3.

Table Q 70 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class.

Generic Program

			Number of Journals					
	Grad. Resp. Int.	Respondents	One			Two or more		
Class	years	N	N		%	N		%
1954	13	20	6		30.0	2		20.0
1955	12	17	5		29.4	2		11.8
1956	11	32	6		18.8	7		21.9
1957	10	23	7		30.4	2		8.7
1958	9	27	5		18.5	6		22.2
1959	8	17	8		47.1	1		5.9
1960	7	18	7		38.9	1		5.6
1961	6	17	4		23.5	2		11.8
1962	5	21	7		33.3	6		28.6
1963	4	6	1		16.7	0		0.0
1964	3	15	9		60.0	2		13.3
1965	2	16	9		56.3	3		18.8
1966	2	22	13		59.1	3		13.6
1967	2	12	6		50.0	1		8.3
1968	2	34	20		58.8	4		11.8
1969	2	26	13		50.0	3		11.5
1970	2	36	15		41.7	8		22.2
1971	2	24	5		20.8	14		3.4
1972	2	19	11		57.9	4		14.5
1973	2	21	12		57.1	2		9.5
1974	2	33	14		42.4	8		24.2
		* 456	183	Av	40.1	83	Av	18.2
Average for 3 - 13 years				Av	30.5		Av	15.5
Average for 2 years				Av	48.6		Av	20.6

*190 respondents 41.7%
subscribed to none

Table Q 70 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' (continued) UTCN Program and by Class.

Registered Nurse Program

Class	Respondents	Number of Journals One		Two or more	
	N	N	%	N	%
1954	3	1	33.3	1	33.3
1955	3	0	0.0	1	33.3
1956	1	0	0.0	1	33.3
1957	4	0	0.0	2	50.0
1958	7	2	28.6	4	57.1
1959	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1960	2	0	0.0	1	50.0
1961	4	2	50.0	2	50.0
1962	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
1963	1	0	0.0	1	100.0
1964	5	3	60.0	2	40.0
1965	4	1	25.0	3	75.0
1966	6	3	50.0	1	16.7
1967	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	3	3	100.0	0	0.0
1969	5	2	40.0	1	20.0
1970	1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1971	8	2	25.0	5	62.5
1972	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
1973	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1974	8	1	12.5	6	75.0
	*75	23	Av 30.7	38	Av 50.7
Average for 3 - 13 years			Av 29.4		Av 50.0
Average for 2 years			Av 31.7		Av 51.0

*14 respondents 18.7%
subscribed to none

The findings presented in Table Q 70 #3 indicated that

registered nurse program respondents subscribed to a greater number of nursing journals (1.5 per respondent) than did generic program respondents (0.8 per respondent) and this was the case regardless of differences in the graduation-response intervals; approximately 80% of the registered nurse program respondents subscribed to one or more nursing journals at the time they answered Q One;

generic program respondents reached only a 70% subscription rate among respondents answering 2 years after graduation and this rate dropped to 46% among those answering 3-13 years after graduation.

The findings for an identical question to the Vanderbilt[1] study, based on an N of 684, were reported as follows: "Fifty percent of the sample subscribe to one or more professional journals. Many comments were made on the questionnaire stating that many of the professional journals were available at the place of employment and, therefore, individual subscriptions were not necessary."

These findings compare with the UTCN finding that 61.6% of respondents reported having current subscriptions to one or more nursing journals.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 48

CHAPTER 5

HONORS AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

The subject of honors, awards and professional achievement of respondents is addressed in this chapter.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Question 67: "Are you currently a member of any honorary societies? (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 67 #1.

Table Q 67 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships.

Number of Honorary Society Memberships	Responses N	%
One	69	13.1
Two	7	1.3
Three	0	0.0
Four or more	0	0.0
None	449	85.5
Total	525	99.9

When these findings are compared with the write in responses to Part 3 of Question 71 (Chapter 5 Volume 2) it is justified to assume that 16 respondents who reported being members of at least one honorary society in Table Q 67 #1 were members of honorary societies other than Sigma Theta Tau since only sixty respondents answered positively to this item in Question 71.

The seven respondents who recorded that they held membership in two honorary socieites were found, one each, in the Classes that graduated in 1958 and 1971, two in the Class that graduated in 1964 and three in the Class that graduated in 1972.

A comparison was made of the responses made by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 67 #2.

Table Q 67 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of honor societies in which membership is held	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
One	69	13.1	56	12.4	13	17.3
Two	7	1.3	3	0.7	4	5.3
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
None	449	85.5	391	86.9	58	77.3
Total	525	99.9	450	100.0	75	99.9

The percent of responses for membership in one, two and no honorary societies, by respondents' UTCN program, by 2 graduation–response intervals and by Class is presented in Table Q 67 #3.

Table Q 67 #3. Percent of Responses for Membership in One, Two and No Honorary Societies by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals by Class.

Generic Program

Class	G–R Interval Years	Respondents N	One Society N	One Society %	Two Societies N	Two Societies %	None N	None %
1954	13	20	2	10.0	0	0.0	18	90.0
1955	12	17	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	100.0
1956	11	32	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	100.0
1957	10	23	1	4.3	0	0.0	22	95.7
1958	9	26	2	7.7	0	0.0	24	92.3
1959	8	17	1	5.9	0	0.0	16	94.1
1960	7	18	1	5.6	0	0.0	17	94.4
1961	6	17	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	100.0
1962	5	21	2	9.5	0	0.0	19	90.5
1963	4	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0
1964	3	14	2	14.3	0	0.0	12	85.7
1965	2	16	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	100.0
1966	2	22	2	9.1	0	0.0	20	90.9
1967	2	12	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7
1968	2	33	1	3.0	0	0.0	32	97.0
1969	2	25	3	12.0	0	0.0	22	88.0
1970	2	36	9	25.0	0	0.0	27	75.0
1971	2	24	8	33.3	1	4.2	15	62.5
1972	2	19	6	31.6	2	10.5	11	57.9
1973	2	21	5	23.8	0	0.0	16	76.2
1974	2	32	9	28.1	0	0.0	23	71.9
Total		450	56	12.0 mean	3	1.4 mean	391	87.8 mean
Graduation–Response Intervals 3–13 years			mean of percent	7.0		0.0		93.0
2 years			mean of percent	17.4		1.4		81.1

Table Q 67 #3 continued.

Registered Nurse Program

Class	Respondents N	One Society N	One Society %	Two Societies N	Two Societies %	None N	None %
1954	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
1955	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
1956	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1957	4	2	50.0	0	0.0	2	50.0
1958	8	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0
1959	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
1960	2	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
1961	4	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0
1962	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1963	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1964	5	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0
1965	4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
1966	6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
1967	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
1969	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0
1970	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1971	8	4	50.0	0	0.0	4	50.0
1972	3	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
1973	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
1974	8	2	25.0	0	0.0	6	75.0
Total	75	13	12.7 mean	4	4.1 mean	58	78.5 mean
Graduation–Response Intervals 3–13 years		mean of percent	15.5		4.8		79.7
2 years		mean of percent	9.5		3.3		77.2

The findings for Question 67 should be considered in light of the fact that the local honor society, Upsilon Tau, was instituted in the spring of 1970 and the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau, the National Honor Society of Nursing, was established in the spring of 1972 at UTCN. In 1972, graduates from the Classes 1954 through 1969 were nominated for membership.

No attempt has been made to establish comparable representativeness of the 76 respondents who reported honor society membership in Question 67 with the respondents who answered Q One and/or the respondents who were known to have been inducted into Beta Theta Chapter.

The findings presented in Tables Q 67 #2 and #3 indicated that

the increase in the rate of membership in honor socieites was directly related to the establishment of the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau at UTCN;

the proportion of registered nurse program respondents reporting membership in one or more honor societies (29.3%) was twice the proportion of generic program respondents reporting the same thing.

A comparison was made between the findings in the NLN[1] and UTCN studies concerning membership in honor societies. The NLN report stated "......146 baccalaureate degree program graduates were members of honor societies in nursing." Although it is not specifically stated in the NLN report, it was assumed by the writers, that the total N to be used in this comparison was 1650 baccalaureate degree program respondents. (See Table 35.) If this was indeed the case, 8.8% of the baccalaureate program respondents in the NLN study were members of nursing honor societies. In the UTCN study, 59 of the 450 generic program respondents, 13.1% reported being members of one or more honor societies, including honor societies in nursing.

Although the questionnaire used in the Vanderbilt study asked for information about membership in Sigma Theta Tau, no findings are included in the report.

In part One of Question 71 respondents were asked to identify honors they received while in school or later and to specify additional honors they had received that were not listed in Q One.
The honors that were listed were as follows:

The Faculty Award, conferred each year 1955 through 1974 on the graduate with the highest scholastic average in the class.

The Trustees Award, conferred each year 1955 through 1962 by the Board of the John Gaston Hospital on "the graduate who showed herself to be most mindful of the welfare of her patients."

Membership in Sigma Theta Tau, honorary society of nursing. An honorary society, Upsilon Tau, was established in the College of Nursing in 1968 as prerequisite to the establishment of a chapter of Sigma Theta Tau. The Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau was chartered at the College of Nursing in 1972.

---

[1] Knopf, L., RNs One and Five Years After Graduation, PP. 35–36.

The findings for Part One of Question 71 were as follows:

The Faculty Award was given to 20 persons during this time span. Sixteen of them, including one graduate of the Registered Nurse Program, responded to Questionnaire One and identified the fact that they received the Faculty Award. Two responded to the Questionnaire but did not answer Question 71. The remaining two recipients did not respond to the Questionnaire.

The Board of Trustees Award was given to 8 persons during this time span. Seven of them responded to Questionnaire One and identified the fact that they had received the Trustees Award. One recipient did not respond to Questionnaire One.

Sixty respondents reported that they were members of Sigma Theta Tau, including 25 graduates of the Registered Nurse Program. The distribution of these 60 members among the Beta Theta Chapter and other chapters is presented in Table Q 71 #1.

Table Q 71 #1. Distribution of Sigma Theta Tau Membership by Respondents' UTCN Program and Chapter.

	Total Membership	Generic Program	Registered Nurse Program
All Chapters	60	45	15
Beta Theta Chapter	39	34	5
Other Chapters	21	11	10

Respondents reported having received these awards and honors in addition to the ones listed in Question 71:

The Alumni Award
The Sophmore Award
Outstanding Student Nurse
Public Health Nurse of the Year 1961
Outstanding Young Women of 1966

The Alumni Award, which replaced the Trustees Award in 1965, and was conferred, thereafter, each year through 1974, recognized the graduate who had the highest grade point average in clinical nursing courses, in each Class. The Alumni Award was given to eleven persons in this time span. Eight of them, including one graduate of the Registered Nurse Program responded to Questionnaire One and identified the fact that they had received the Alumni Award. One recipient responded to Questionnaire One but did not answer Question 71. Two additional recipients did not respond to Questionnaire One.

The Sophmore Award began in 1966 as the "Class of 1965 Award." The name was changed in 1968 to the "Sophomore Award" and in 1970 to the First Year Award. Its purpose had been the same throughout – namely to recognize a student for outstanding performance in the first year of the generic program in the College of Nursing, the selection being made jointly by students and faculty.

Two respondents reported having received the Sophmore Award.

The Outstanding Student Nurse Competition was sponsored by the Tennessee Association of Student Nurses

2 respondents were named Outstanding Student Nurse of Tennessee
1 respondent was named Outstanding Student Nurse of District One T.A.S.N.
3 respondents were named to represent The University of Tennessee College of Nursing in the District Contest

In addition to the above awards

1 respondent reported being named Public Health Nurse of the Year 1961 for New Mexico
1 respondent reported being named to Who's Who in American Colleges, 1953
1 respondent reported being named to Who's Who of American Women, 1966–67
1 respondent reported being named Outstanding Young Woman in 1966 (region not specified)

Question 71 Part 1 was not repeated on Q Two. For information about honors, awards and Sigma Theta Tau membership associated with the five year period between questionnaires, see the report of findings under the heading, Significant Things Omitted from the Questionnaire, Question 38 on Q Two in Volume 2 Chapter 7.

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Respondents reported on their activities as consultants, public speakers, published authors and researchers in Parts Two through Four of Question 71, Q One.

CONSULTATIONS

Question 71 Part Two asked respondents to: "List your consultant type activities, giving organization and area."

There were 28 respondents who reported acting as consultant, including 20 graduates of the generic program and 8 graduates of the registered nurse program. Three of the graduates of the generic program held the masters degree, while six of the registered nurse program graduates held the masters degree when they reported being consultants.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #2

Table Q 71 #2. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q One.

Subject in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization seeking Consultation	Number
Nursing as a Career	2	Girl Scout Troops	2
	2	Future Nurse Clubs	2
Nursing, General	1	County Title I Advisory	1
		Committee	1
Nursing Education;			
Accreditation by NLN	1	Hospital School of Nursing	1
Curriculum Development	1	Hosptial School of Nursing	1
Nursing Service Administration;			
Nurse Professional Standards	1	VA Hosptial Nursing Staff	1
Nursing Service Admininstration	1	Community Hosptial	1
Team Nursing, Implementation and Follow-up	1	ANA Local District	1
Clinical Nursing:			
Rehabilitation	1	Insurance Company	1
Care of Children during Disaster	1	Public Health Department Personnel	1
Coronary Care Nursing	1	Community Hosptial	1
Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation	1	Nursing Education Committee of Heart Assoc.	1
Pediatric Nursing	1	Community Hospital Nursing Staff	1
Public Health Nursing	1	Association for Retarded Children	1
Infection Surveillance	1	Community Hospital Staff	2

Table Q 71 #2. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q One. (continued)

Subject in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization seeking Consultation	Number
Role of Family Nurse Clinician	1	Collegiate Nursing Program Faculty	2
Education of Expectant Parent	1	Am. Red Cross Chapter	1
Nursing Care of Newborn	1	Regional Medical Program Staff	1
Maternity Nursing	1	La Leche League	1
Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing	1	Urban Hosptial Staff	1
Poisoning and Emergency Medicine	1	Poison Center	1
		Community College	1
Care of spinal cord injured patient	1	VA Hosptial – Staff in Medical–surg & psychiatric units	1
Aging and Nutrition	1	Regional Development Center for Government Training – Professionals working with the Elderly	1
Retardation Nursing	3	Retardation Services Staff	1
		HEW Research Project Staff	1
		Halfway House for Retarded Adults Staff	1
Total number of Consultations	28	Total number of Organizations	31

Question 32: Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List your consultant type activities giving organization and area" for the period of time covered by this questionnaire.

There were 31 respondents who reported acting as consultants including 24 graduates of the generic program and 7 graduates of the registered nurse program.

Thirteen of the graduates of the generic program held the masters degree, one additional graduate held the doctoral degree and all eight of the graduates of the registered nurse program held the masters degree when they reported being consultants.

Thirty eight consultations were reported by the 31 respondents as follows:

19 respondents reported only 1 consultation each
7 respondents reported 2 consultations each
1 respondent reported 5 consultations
4 respondents reported the organizations for which they acted as consultants but did not identify the area of consultation.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #3 .

Table Q 71 #3. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q Two.

Subjects in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization Seeking Consultation	Number
Nursing as a Career	0		0
Nursing – General			
Nursing	4	Unihealth Service Corp. Inc.	1
		Advisory Board County H.D.	1
		Advisory Board County Health Education Board	1
		Association for Retarded Children	1
Free Health Care for Residents	1	Housing Project Clinic	1
Nursing Education			
Accreditation by NLN	1	Not specified	
Curriculum Development	1	Collegiate Program faculty	1
Curriculum Development in Rehabilitation Nursing	1	Collegiate Program Faculty	1
Program for Disadvantaged Nursing Students	1	Diploma Program Faculty	1
Planning and Coordinating Continuing Education for RNs and LPNs	2	Regional Health Council 14 counties	1
		MultiCounty Area of State Hosptial Assn.	1
Grant Writing and Continuing Application Preparation	1	Psychiatric Clinic of Regional Public Health Office	1
Nursing Theory Development	1	Faculty in Graduate Program in Nursing	1
Internatioal Nursing Clinical Specialization	1	Faculty in Collegiate School in Nursing	1
Latin Culture	1	Clinical Transplant Center	1
Nursing Care Plans	1	Community Hosptials	1
Nursing Inservice Education	2	Community Hosptials	1
		City & County Health Dept.	1
Nursing Service Administration			
Problem Oriented Medical Records System	1	V.A. Hospital Staff	1
Nursing Service Administration	1	Nursing Service Dept. Community Hospital	1
Nursing Audit and Quality Control	1	State Psychiatric Hosptial Staff	1

Table Q 71 #3. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q Two. (continued)

Subjects in which Consultation was Provided	Number	*Organization Seeking* Consultation	Number
Clinical Nursing			
Cardio–Pulmonary Resuscitation & Artificial Respiration	1	Rescue Squad Members Grade School Children	1 1
Public Health Nurse	1	Regional Medical Program Head Start Program Regional Committee on Aging	1 1 1
Home Follow–up	1	Clinical Research Center	1
Infection Surveillance	1	Community Hospitals	1
Maternity Care	1	City & County Health Dept.	1
Maternal and Child Health	1	Regional Public Health Service	1
Psychiatric Nursing	1	Hospital Nursing Staff	1
Psychiatric Needs	1	Hospital Head Nurses	1
Nursing the Mentally Retarded	1	Public Health Department	1
Emotional Problems	1	Clinical Research Center Staff	1
Behavior Problems in Children	1	City Public School System	1
Early Childhood Education and Development	1	Parents in 3 cooperating Preschool programs	1
The Family	1	Hospital Head Nurses	1
Family Therapy	1	Health Center	1
Suicide Prevention	1	not specified	
Effects of Disaster	1	Office of Emergency Preparedness Washington, D.C.	1
Community Planning related to Drug Use	1	not specified	
Intensive Care Nursing	1	Hospital Systems Staff	1
Breast Cancer	1	American Cancer Society	1
Uterine Task Force	1	American Cancer Society	1
Area not specified		Regional Educational Corp. Advisory Board of County Health Department City Rape and Crisis Center C.H.E.C. (no further identification)	1 1 1 1
Total number of consultations	41	Total number of organizations	45

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Two Q One and Question 38 Q Two indicated that

not only had the number of consultations reported increased from Q One to Q Two, but there had been increases in the variety and degree of sophistication of the subjects of the consultations.

PUBLIC SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

Question 71 Part Three asked respondents to: "List your public speaking activities giving subject and audience." Thirty two respondents reported public speaking activities. The 52 public speaking activities (subjects multiplied by the number of respondents who presented each subject) were reported by the 32 respondents as follows:

19 respondents reported only one subject each
8 respondents reported two subjects each
4 respondents reported three subjects each
1 respondent reported five subjects.

The 61 appearances before audiences were reported by the 32 respondents as follows:

18 respondents reported addressing one audience each
7 respondents reported addressing two audiences each
6 respondents reported addressing three audiences each
1 respondent reported addressing five audiences
1 respondent reported addressing seven audiences.

In two instances the nature of the audience was not specified.

The 32 respondents included six registered nurse program respondents.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #4

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q One.

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Nursing as a Career	6	Junior & Senior HS Students	3
		Future Nurse Clubs	2
		High School Counselors	1
Sex Education	2	9-18 year old students	1
		Teenage Church Group	1
Health Needs of Pre–School Children	1	Parent Teacher Association	1
Pilot Program for Practical Nursing in High School	1	Not specified	
Children and Safety	1	Girl Scout Group	1
Recognizing the Emotionally Disturbed Child	1	Teachers	1
Meeting the Emotional Needs of Children	2	Nursery school teacher	1
		Parent Teacher Association	1

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q One. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
The Teacher's Role in a Health Program	1	Parent Teacher Association	1
Poisoning and Emergency Medicine	1	Visiting Nurse Association Pre School Staff Community College Students	1 1 1
Nursing			
Heart Disease	1	Heart Association Forum	1
Fear of Death in Patients with Congestive Heart Disease	1	Registered and licensed practical nurses	1
Self Examination of Breast	1	College Student Wives Club	1
Student Experience in Work Study Program of American Cancer Society	1	Not specified	
Care of Colostomy Patient	1	Registered nurse Inservice Class	1
"To Smoke or Not to Smoke"	1	Student Body of a College	1
Care of Alcoholic Patient	1	ANA District members	1
Nursing in Neurological Conditions	1	Workshop for Nurses	1
Lamaze Childbirth	1	Expectant Parent Group	1
Role of the Labor Room Nurse	1	Regional Conference for Physicians and Nurses	1
Temperature Concerns of Neonatal Nurses	1	Nurses	1
Regional Transport Needs of the Newborn	1	County Medical Society	1
Care of High Risk Newborn	1	Neonatal nurses	1
Red Cross Blood Bank Program	1	Junior Auxiliary of Medical Society	1
First Aid in the Home	1	Jaycettes	1
Cardio–pulmonary Resuscitation	1	Cotillion Club Dentists and Physicians	1 1
Public Health			
Development of Chronic Illness Program in a Health Department	1	Public Health Nurses	1

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q one. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Services Offered by the P.H. Department	2	Parent Teachers Association	1
		Preschool Staff	1
		Home Demonstrators Club	1
Health and Preventive Measures	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
		Methodist Youth Fellowship	1
		Ladies' Club	1
		American Red Cross Chapter	1
		4H Club	1
		Girl Scout Group	1
		Boy Scout Group	1
Communicable Diseases	1	Power Co. Employees	1
Medicare and the Public Health Nurse	1	UTCN Alumni	1
Role of the Pediatric Nurse Associate in the Public Health Agency	1	Baccalaureate nursing students	1
Nursing Education			
Legal Implications of Charting	1	Registered Nurses & Licensed Practical Nurses League Workshop	1
Use of Educational Television	1	League Meeting	1
New Things Occurring in Psychiatric Nursing	1	UTCN Alumni	1
Primary Nursing	1	Nursing Inservice Educators	1
Sexual Identity	1	Inservice Class of RNs and LPNs	1
The Therapeutic Community	1	Nursing Assistants	1
Adult Education	1	Registered and Licensed Practical Nurses at League Workshop	1
"Administrators are Human"	1	Continuing Education Workshop for Nurses	1
On Nursing Education	1	Hospital Auxiliary	1
		Community College Faculty	1
Summer Student Program on Mental Deficiency at Diagnostic and Evaluation Center	1	Regional Association on Mental Deficiency	1

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q One. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Role of the Pediatric Nurse Associate or Practitioner	2	ANA District Meetings	2
Role of the Pediatric Nurse Associate vs. the Physician's Assistant	1	Health Educators	1
Totals	52	Total audiences	61

Question 33 Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List your professional public speaking activities giving subject and audience" for the period of time covered by this Questionnaire. Fifty respondents reported public speaking activities. The 86 public speaking activities, (the subjects multiplied by the number of respondents who presented each subject) were reported by the 51 respondents as follows:

31 respondents reported only one subject each
9 respondents reported two subjects each
9 respondents reported three subjects each
2 respondents reported five subjects each

The 100 appearances before audiences were reported by the 50 respondents as follows:

28 reported addressing one audience each
10 reported addressing two audiences each
6 reported addressing three audiences each
2 reported addressing four audiences each
3 reported addressing five audiences each
1 reported addressing seven audiences

In three instances the nature of the audience was not specified.

The fifty one respondents included eight registered nurse program respondents.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #5

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two.

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Nursing as a Career	5	High School Students	2
		Future Nurse Club	1
		TV audience	1
		College Students	1

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Health Careers	2	High School students	1
		High School counselors	1
Child Care and Development			
School Health	1	Parent Teacher Association	1
How Teachers Can Assist with School Health Programs	1	Teachers in Inservice Program	1
Visual Screening	1	Students in College of Education	1
General Health and Nutrition	2	Elementary school students	2
Regional Child Development Program	1	Nurses	1
		Mental Health Association	1
Sex Education and Personhood	1	Church group of teenage girls	1
Drug abuse	3	School children	1
		District Nurses' Association	1
		Not specified	
Adolescents and Families	1	Not specified	
Child Abuse	1	Community Service Volunteers	1
Early Childhood Education and Development	1	Parents of Preschool Children	1
Child Psychology	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
Human Growth and Development	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
		Pre School Association	1
Nursing			
Anesthesia	1	Staff Nurses	1
Nursing Care Process	1	Nurses	1
Medical Hypnosis	1	Nurses Organization	1
		Civic Group	1
		Nursing Students	1
Hyphosis	1	Nurse Anesthetist students	1
Changes in Nursing and Attitudes toward Nursing	1	Women's Club	1
Sudden Infant Death Syndrome	1	Public Health Nurses	1
Orientation to being a patient in Pediatric Hosptial	1	First Grade students	1
Birth Control	2	High School Students	2

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Maternal & Infant Care	3	Red Cross Volunteers	2
		High School Students	1
Care of Spinal Cord Injury Patients	1	Physicians and Nurses	1
Cardio–pulmonary Resuscitation	2	High School students	1
		Girl Scouts	1
		Boy Scouts	1
		Wesleyan Youth Foundation	1
Dialysis	2	Nurses	2
Nursing in Renal Failure	1	District Nurses' Association	1
		Private Duty Nurses	1
The Nurse Practitioner	1	Nurses and laypeople	1
The Lamaze Childbirth Experience	1	Collegiate Nursing Students	1
Nursing for the Stroke Patient	1	Nurses in Continuing Education	1
Nursing and Diabetes	2	Nutritionists, Nurses and Physicians	2
Intensive Care Nursing	1	Nurses and Physicians	1
Coronary Care Nursing	1	Rotary Club	1
		Civitan Club	1
		Exchange Club	1
		Women's Club	1
Sickle Cell Disease	1	High School Students	1
Chronic Illnesses of Children	1	Students in Special Education	1
Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities	1	Regional meeting of American Association of Mental Retardation	1
Day Care for the Retarded	1	Nursing Division American Association of Mental Deficiency	1
Nurse Midwifery	1	Deans in School of Public Health	1
		Nursing Students	1
Psychological Aspects of Disaster	1	Trainees in Red Cross Disaster Course	1

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audiences	Number
Transactional Analysis	1	Social Workers in Workshop	1
Interviewing Skills	1	Psychiatric Nurses in Workshop	1
Statement on Psychiatric Nursing Practice	1	Psychiatric Nurses Conference Group	1
Nurses Role in Suicide Prevention	1	District Nurses' Association	1
Death, Impact and Implications	1	Nurses of Regional Medical Program	1
Latency Age Group Therapy	1	Child Welfare Workers	1
Effects of Activity Group Therapy on Self Concept of Chronic Schizophrenic Patients	1	Nurses' Association	1
Nursing Care of Adolescent Drug Abusers	1	Nurses' Alumni Association	1
Relation of Mobility to Man's Health Status	1	Faculty and Students in Collegiate nursing program	1
Book Review of "Born to Win"	1	Psychiatric Hospital Staff	1
Women's Issues	1	Not specified	
Public Health			
Immunization	1	Expectant Mothers Group	1
What are the Duties of the School Nurse	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
The Role of the Public Health Nurse	1	Church Group Sixth Grade Students	1 1
Planned Parenthood	2	School Group Planned Parenthood Volunteers	1 1
Problems of Population Control	1	Planned Parenthood Volunteers Physicians Wives	1 1
Pre–Natal Care, Does it Make A Difference?	1	Public Health Nurses	1
Program for Unwed Mothers	1	Ob–Gyn Nurses	1

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audiences	Number
Stress Syndrome in Intensive Care Unit and Implications for Occupational Health Nurses	1	American Public Health Association Convention	1
Nursing Education			
Remedial Programs for High Risk Students in Diploma Programs	1	APGA Tennessee League for Nursing	2 1
Clinical Evaluation for Disadvantages Students	1	Council of Diploma Program Nurses in SREB Workshop	2 1
Issues Confronting Nurses	1	Nurses	1
Educational Programs using Ladder Concept	1	District Nurses' Association	1
Associate Degree Education in Nursing	1	State Associate Degree Faculty	1
Methods of Artriculation in Nursing Education	1	Deans, Directors of Nursing Programs	1
Nursing Theoretical Framework	1	Nurses in Clinical Sessions	1
Relation of Biological Rhythms to Nursing's Conceptual Framework	1	Nurses in Workshop	1
Teaching Research	1	ZOT Day Audience	1
Doctoral Curriculum	1	Nurses in Clinical Session	1
Nursing Service			
Leadership and Management in Nursing	1	Nursing Service Administrators	1
Anxiety, Key Concept in Nursing Management	1	Nurses' Association	1
Changing Roles of Nursing; Why the Change and What of the Future	1	National League for Nursing in Convention	1
Totals	86	Total Audiences	100

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Three Q One and Question 33 Q Two indicated that

not only had the number of professional public speaking appearances reported increased from Q One to Q Two but there had also been an increase in the variety of the topics presented.

PUBLISHING ACTIVITIES

Question 71 Part Four asked respondents to: "List exact titles and references for all professional addresses, articles, books, or research studies that you have had accepted for publication."

Six respondents reported the following:

"An Issue in Nursing" in Tomorrow's Nurse, 4:28–31 April–May, 1963.

"Identifying and Meeting Patient Needs in Short Span Nurse–Patient Relationships" in Nursing Forum, Spring 1966.

"I Like Eggs" in The American Journal of Nursing, June 1965.

A letter to the Editor, in Nursing Outlook 1974.

"Colostomy – What Now." A booklet for patients published by the Veterans' Administration.

"Shock: Pathology and Implications for Nursing Care." in Self Instructional Materials for Health Care Professionals.

One respondent among these six was a registered nurse program respondent.

Question 34, Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List exact titles and references for all professional addresses, articles, books or research studies that you have had accepted for publication."

Twelve respondents reported the following:

Publications of respondents who reported one publication each were

"Psychological Effects of Nurses in Disaster," in Nursing Research, July–August 1973.

"Nursing Care of the Child with Subacute Sclerosing Panencephalitis," in American Journal of Nursing.

"Helping the Family Cope with Subacute Sclerosing Panencephalitis," in American Journal of Nursing.

"Separation Anxiety, A Personal Look," in American Journal of Nursing.

"Nursing in a Developing Area," in Tennessee Nurses' Association Bulletin, April, 1972.

"Miss Washington – A Difficult–to–accept Patient," in Nursing, 1973.

"Changing Roles: Why the Changes? What of the Future?" Publication # 20–1503, National League for Nursing.

Publications of respondents who reported four publications each were:

"Interagency Contract: A Cooperative Effort in Community Methadone Programming." in Proceedings, 5th Annual Methadone Conference.

"Behavioral Contracts in Methadone Programs," in Proceedings, 5th Anual Methadone Conference.

"Drug Abuse Problems or Issues for the Psychiatric Nurse Practitioner," in Professional Development in Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing published by the American Nurses' Association, in 1975.

"Psychotherapeutic Intervention with the Addict Client," in Nursing Clinics of North America, September 1976.

"1966 Student Work Programs in Mental Retardation," in Public Health Reports #83 in 1968.

"Interdisciplinary Training," –Feeding the Handicapped Child, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center, 1971.

"The Validity of Interdisciplinary Training Programs: A Survey of One UAF's Trainees," – The Identification and Management of Selected Developmental Disabilities: A Guide for Nurses, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center, 1973.

"The Efficiency of Short Term Training: Workshops and Behavioral Change," – The Identification and Management of Selected Developmental Disabilities published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center, 1973.

Publications of two respondents who reported five publications each are:

"Evaluation and Prediction of Clinical Performance in a School of Nursing," published by St. Mary's Memorial Hospital School of Nursing, Knoxville, 1971.

"Second Chance," in Hospitals, Journal of the American Hospital Association, January 1972.

"How Do We Help High Risk Students?" in Nursing Outlook, February 1972.

"Three Therapeutic Models: Similarities and Differences," Monograph published in Knoxville, 1972.

"Some Objective Approaches to Evaluation." in League Exchange #86 published by the National League for Nursing.

"Time Estimation in Relation to Gait Tempo," in Perceptual and Motor Skills, Volume 34, 1972.

"Nursing's Theoretical Evaluation," in Nursing Outlook, Volume 20, 1972.

"Identifying and Meeting Patients' Needs in Short–span Nurse–patient Relationships," in The Challenge of Nursing, Margaret E. Auld and Linda Hulthen Berum, editors. Published by C.V. Mosby Co., 1973.

"Relationships of Biological Rhythms to Nursing's Conceptual System," in Proceedings of Nursing Institute on Biological Rhythms, The Catholic University of America, Washington D.C., April 1973.

"A Source Book for Nursing Research," published by F.A. Davis & Co., Philadelphia, 1973.

Publications of 1 respondent who reported six publications are:

"The Denver Developmental Screening Test in Nursing Application," a film produced by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1969.

"A Nursing Study of Day Care for Mentally Retarded Children," published by The University of Tennessee Medical Units in 1971.

"Relationship of Nursing to Nutrition," – Feeding the Handicapped Child, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1971.

"Nursing Assessment" Feeding the Handicapped Child, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1971.

"The Identification and Management of Selected Developmental Disabilities: A Guide for Nurses," published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1973.

"Hypervalinemia: A Family's Reaction, A Nursing Challenge," in Nursing Forum.

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Four Q One and Question 34 Q Two indicated that

as might be expected, the number of publications reported has increased over time and they have been generated mainly by those in academic settings.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Question 71 Part Five asked respondents to: "List titles of all nursing research projects in which you have been one of the investigators exclusive of master's theses and doctoral dissertations."

Seven respondents reported the following studies:

A study comparing nursing salaries in larger hospitals in Indianapolis to salaries of teachers in the same area.

An asthma study connected with a College of Medicine, gathering data while visiting out–patients in their homes, 1960.

A study to develop a staff orientation schedule.

A study to promote better use of nursing care plans.

A study on team nursing.

A study to identify how to educate and train child behavior specialists.

A study of manic depressive illness; managed study subjects on in–patient ward.

A study of the effectiveness of electrical tooth brushing versus conventional brushing.

One respondent reported participating in two studies.

One respondent was a graduate of the registered nurse program.

Question 34 Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List the titles of all nursing research projects in which you have been one of the investigators, exclusive of masters theses and doctoral dissertations."

Four respondents reported one research project each, as follows:

A study of the evaluation of clinical practice in a diploma school of nursing.

A nursing study of day care for mentally retarded children.

A study of the use of computers in nursing.

A study of individualized education for pre and post surgical patients: the effect of instruction by initial anxiety trait.

One respondent reported two research projects as follows:

A study of the walking rate in relation to time perception.

A study of space–time relationships in older adults.

Six respondents reported one project each that was not of a strictly research design.

The subjects were as follows:

A project to develop a remedial program for high risk students in a diploma school of nursing.

A project to develop self learning and pacing modules in pediatric nursing at a collegiate school of nursing.

A state–wide study of school health nurses to determine their educational levels and their performance of functions and the importance of these functions.

An investigation of the effects of Hurricane Celia on Corpus Christi for the American Red Cross.

A project to develop an "experimental" one year practical nursing program designed to permit transfer of graduates, without loss of credit, to cooperating associate degree programs in the same state.

The Five School Consortium in Memphis, designed to identify similarities and differences among, diploma, associate degree and baccalaureate curricula with a view to proposing a core curriculum in nursing.

Two of these ten respondents were registered nurse program respondents.

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Five Q One and Question 35 Q Two indicated that

although the number of research activities reported was small overall, there has been some increase in number and sophistication of topics from Q One to Q Two responses.

CHAPTER 6

CONTINUOUS NURSING CAREERS

In this chapter, responses from respondents in the modal and non–modal groups, to some of the questions that are dealt with in Volume 2, are compared.

The modal group numbered 100 generic program respondents, each of whom was employed full–time or part–time in nursing, or was engaged in the study of nursing at the time each answered Q One and Q Two. The respondents in the modal group thus constituted a group of UTCN graduates who had been engaged in nursing activities almost continuously since graduation. They were members of the Classes of 1954 through 1969.

The non–modal group numbered 119 generic program respondents who answered both questionnaires but were not necessarily employed in nursing or studying nursing at the time they answered one or the other or both of the questionnaires. They, also, were members of the Classes of 1954 through 1969.

The remaining 105 generic program respondents from these classes who answered Q One did not respond to Q Two and were, therefore, excluded from the following comparisons.

The modal group was numerically representative of the total respondent population, by Class. The composition of the modal and non–modal groups, by Class, is presented in Tables MG #1 and #2 in Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of this report.

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

OCCUPATION OF FATHER

A comparison of the number and percent of responses from modal and non–modal respondents regarding the primary occupation of the father at the time the respondent enrolled in UTCN (Question 3 Q One) is presented in Table A13 Appendix. A summary of the findings of this comparison is presented in Table MG #1.

Summary Table MG #1. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Occupation of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents, by 2 Groups of Classes

Occupation of Father	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
	Total N=100 %	Classes 1954–64 N=53 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=116 %	Classes 1954–64 N-84 %	Classes 1965–69 N-32 %
Profession	13.0	7.5	19.1	20.7	15.5	34.4
Proprietor, business official	32.0	28.3	36.2	40.6	41.6	37.6
Salesman, clerical worker, technician	18.0	17.0	19.2	14.6	13.1	18.8
Farm owner, farm manager	15.0	20.8	8.5	8.6	10.7	3.1
Skilled operator, service worker	19.0	20.8	17.1	12.1	15.5	3.1
Farm worker, laborer	3.0	5.7	0.0	3.4	3.6	3.1
Total	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1

The findings presented in Summary Table MG #1 indicated that

the proportion of the respondents who reported the occupation of the father as professional, proprietor and business official and farm owner and manager was 60% for the modal group, whereas for the non–modal group it was 69.9%;

a greater difference existed between respondents in the two groups who were members of the Classes of 1965 to 1969; modal group respondents in these Classes reported 63.8% of fathers for the three above occupational categories, while non--modal respondents reported 75.1% for father for them;

a still greater difference existed between the modal and non–modal respondents in the later Classes when two occupational categories were considered, namely, professional and proprietor and business official; modal group respondents in the later Classes reported 55.3% of fathers for these two categories, whereas non–modal group respondents reported 72.0% of fathers for them;

although there was an apparent decrease in the proportion of fathers in both groups who were in the occupational category of skilled operator and service worker, in the later Classes of the modal group these fathers were still heavily represented (17.1%) while in the later Classes of the non–modal group, they were hardly represented (3.1%);

on the basis of these occupational data for fathers it was clear that the respondents in the modal group represented a lower socio–economic class than did the respondents in the non–modal group; an inference could be made here to the effect that the modal group utilized nursing as a path for upward mobility.

EMPLOYED/NOT EMPLOYED STATUS OF MOTHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal respondents regarding the employed/not employed status of the mother at the time the respondent enrolled at UTCN (Question 5 Q One) is presented in Table MG #2.

Table MG #2. Percent of Responses for Employment/Not Employed Status of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Mother's Employment Status		
Modal Group	N	Not Employed Responses %	Employed Part–Time Responses %	Employed Full–Time Responses %
Total	100	43.0	8.0	49.0
Classes 1954–64	53	47.2	9.4	43.4
Classes 1965–69	47	38.3	6.4	55.3
Non–modal Group				
Total	119	58.8	4.2	37.0
Classes 1954–64	87	58.6	4.6	36.8
Classes 1965–69	32	59.4	3.1	37.5

The findings presented in Table MG #2 indicated that

the employment rate for the mothers of modal group respondents was higher than the national average for employment of mothers;

the employment rate for the mothers of non–modal respondents was more in keeping with the rate for a random sample of mothers;

the increase in the proportion of employed mothers for respondents in the later Classes of the modal group was not present for their classmates in the non–modal group.

OCCUPATION OF MOTHER

A comparison of the number and percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the occupation of the mother (if she was employed) at the time the respondent entered UTCN (Question 6 Q One) is presented in Table MG #3.

Table MG #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
	N=57	N=28	N=29	N=49	N=36	N=13
Occupation of Mother	%	%	%	%	%	%
Profession	36.8	28.6	44.8	38.8	44.4	23.1
Proprietor, business official	12.3	14.3	10.3	18.4	13.9	30.8
Saleswoman, clerical worker, technician	43.9	42.9	44.8	32.7	27.8	46.2
Skilled operator, service worker	7.1	14.3	0.0	10.2	13.9	0.0
Total	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.1

The findings presented in Table MG #3 indicated that

a greater proportion of the mothers of the non–modal group respondents worked in more highly skilled, and by inference, more highly paid, occupations than was the case for mothers of the modal group respondents;

the small N of mothers of non–modal respondents in the Classes 1965 through 1969 makes comparisons of the findings for the earlier and later Class groups more tentative; while the occupations of the modal group mothers in the earlier Classes are predominantly in the saleswoman, clerical worker category, the occupations of the modal group mothers in the later Classes shifted significantly toward the profession category; the shift in occupations of the non–modal group mothers, from earlier to later Classes was away from the profession category and toward the proprietor, business official and the saleswoman and clerical worker categories.

EDUCATION OF FATHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding levels of education completed by the father (Question 7 Q One) is presented in Table MG #4.

Table MG #4. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
Education Completed by Father	Total N=100 %	Classes 1954–64 N=53 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=119 %	Classes 1954–64 N=87 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %
Grade school	16.0	24.5	6.4	10.9	12.6	6.3
Some high school	21.0	30.2	10.6	16.8	18.4	12.5
High school graduate	18.0	17.0	19.1	22.7	24.1	18.7
Technical/vocational graduate (include RN)	5.0	3.8	6.4	5.0	3.4	9.4
Some college	14.0	13.2	14.9	20.2	21.8	15.6
College graduate	16.0	7.5	25.5	13.4	11.5	18.7
Post graduate	10.0	3.8	17.0	10.9	8.1	18.7
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9

The findings presented in Table MG #4 indicated that

overall, the average level of education completed by the fathers of the modal group respondents was slightly higher than for the fathers of the non–modal respondents;

a striking difference was evident between the level of education completed by fathers of respondents in the earlier Classes of both groups; the proportion of the fathers of the modal group respondents who had completed their education with graduation from high school or less, was 71.7% while for the fathers of non–modal group respondents it was 55.1%;

the level of education completed by fathers of respondents in the later Classes of the modal and non–modal groups was not nearly as discrepant, suggesting continued upward mobility of the families of modal group respondents.

EDUCATION OF MOTHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the level of education completed by the mother (Question 7 Q One) is presented in Table MG #5.

Table MG #5. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Mother for Modal and Non-modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
Education Completed by Mother	Total N=100 %	Classes 1954–64 N=53 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=119 %	Classes 1954–64 N=87 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %
Grade school	6.0	11.3	0.0	6.7	8.0	3.1
Some high school	10.0	15.1	4.3	13.4	16.1	6.3
High school graduate	26.0	28.3	23.4	28.6	24.1	40.6
Technical/vocational graduate (include RN)	16.0	7.5	25.5	16.8	13.8	25.0
Some college, not graduate	22.0	22.6	21.3	20.2	23.0	12.5
College graduate	16.0	13.2	19.1	10.9	12.6	6.3
Post graduate	4.0	1.9	6.4	3.4	2.3	6.3
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1

The findings presented in Table MG #5 indicated that

overall, the average level of education completed by the mothers of modal group respondents was similar to that completed by mothers of non–modal group respondents with the important exception that, as a whole, the proportion of mothers who had graduated from college plus those who had subsequently done post graduate study was 20.0% for modal group mothers and 14.3% for non–modal group mothers;

the education completed by mothers of respondents in the earlier Classes, 1954 through 1964, in the modal and non–modal groups was also similar; it was of interest to note, however, that for the level of graduation from a technical or vocational program (including RN), the proportion for mothers of the modal group respondents was lower (7.5%) than it was for the mothers of non–modal group respondents (13.8%)

a more striking difference was evident between the level of education completed by mothers of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups in the later Classes, 1965 through 1969; in this group, 50.0% of the mothers of non–modal respondents completed their education with graduation from high school or less, while only 27.7% of mothers of modal group respondents ended their education at this level; as might be anticipated on the basis of these data, a considerably higher proportion of mothers of model group respondents in the later Classes had completed some college, had graduated from college and had completed some post graduate work (46.8%) compared with the proportion of mothers of non–modal group respondents who had continued their education beyond the technical programs (25.1%);

although the level of education completed by mothers of respondents in both groups rose from earlier to later Classes, the rise for the mothers of the modal group respondents was dramatic; this increase in the additional years of education reported by mothers of modal group respondents in the later Classes is not seen for the comparable group of non–modal mothers;

one inference to be made was that the modal group mothers used education as a means of socio–economic rise, while the non–modal group mothers no longer used this avenue for self–enhancement, but rather ventured more into proprietorships in the business world (See Table MG #3 Occupation of Mother).

COMPARISON OF EDUCATION COMPLETED BY FATHER AND BY MOTHER

A comparison was made of the proportion of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents for two levels of education completed by father and by mother, namely, high school graduation and less and more than high school graduation. The findings of this comparison for the total groups and 2 Class groupings in each are presented in Table MG #6.

The findings presented in Table MG #6 indicated that

mothers of respondents had a slightly higher level of education than did fathers; this difference was more evident among the parents of the modal group respondents than the non–modal group respondents; one exception to this overall difference was evident in the parents of respondents in the non–modal Classes of 1965 through 1969 among whom the fathers, on the average, had completed a higher level of education than had the mothers;

the changes in the level of education of parents from less education to more education were greater, over time, for both fathers and mothers in the modal group than in the non–modal group; the mothers in the non–modal group evidenced no change in level of education completed over time.

The writers proposed the hypothesis that the mothers of the modal group respondents may have served as better role models for respondents in the matter of educational achievement than did the mothers of non–modal group respondents in that the focus for the model group mothers was on upward mobility through academics.

On the basis of the findings related to occupations and education of parents of respondents in the modal group, the writers proposed an additional hypthesis, that the continuous work record of the modal group respondents may have been positively associated with a view of nursing as a means of achieving upward socio–economic mobility.

NURSING EDUCATION OF MOTHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the level of nursing education, if any, completed by their mothers (Question 4 Q One) is presented in Table MG #7.

Table MG #7. Percent of Responses for Level of Nursing Education Completed by Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Did Your Mother Receive Any Education in Nursing?			
Modal Group	N	No %	Yes Not RN %	Yes RN not BN %	Yes RN and BN %
Total	100	90.0	2.0	7.0	1.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	94.3	1.9	3.8	0.0
Classes 1965–1969	47	85.1	2.1	10.6	2.1
Non–modal Group					
Total	119	84.9	5.0	10.1	0.0
Classes 1954–1964	87	83.9	6.9	9.2	0.0
Classes 1965–1969	32	87.5	0.0	12.5	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #7 indicated that there was a slightly higher proportion of mothers of non–modal group respondents than of modal group respondents who had had some education in nursing; the level of this kind of education, among mothers of respondents in both groups, was concentrated in the category of registered nurses who did not hold the bachelor degree in nursing and this level of nursing education was more evident among mothers of respondents in the later than in the earlier Classes in both groups.

The sample on which these findings are based is admittedly small. However, the writers suggested that having mothers who were registered nurses, or who had studied nursing but were not registered nurses, was somewhat negatively related to the degree to which the respondent followed a continuous nursing career.

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding their birth order among siblings (Question 8 Q One) is presented in Table MG #8.

Table MG #8. Percent of Responses for Birth Order Among Siblings for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Sibling Birth Order			
Modal Group	N	Only Child %	Oldest Child %	Youngest Child %	None of These %
Total	100	14.0	35.0	26.0	25.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	13.2	35.8	28.3	22.6
Classes 1965–1969	47	14.9	34.0	23.4	27.7
Non–modal Group					
Total	119	10.1	40.3	29.4	20.2
Classes 1954–1964	87	10.5	39.1	31.0	19.5
Classes 1965–1969	32	9.4	43.8	25.0	21.9

The findings presented in Table MG #8 indicated that

there was no difference, worthy of note, in the proportion of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups and in the Class groupings in the four categories of birth order of the respondents.

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the number of sibling they had, if any, (Question 9 Q One) is presented in Table MG #9.

Table MG #9. Percent of Responses for Number of Siblings for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Siblings Living Past Infancy								
Modal Group	N	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight or more
Total	99	15.2	45.5	17.2	7.1	7.1	4.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	13.2	50.9	11.3	5.7	7.5	5.7	3.8	1.9	0.0
Classes 1965–1969	46	17.4	39.1	23.9	8.7	6.5	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0
Non–modal Group										
Total	119	10.9	41.2	21.0	10.9	8.4	4.2	1.7	0.0	1.7
Classes 1954–1964	87	10.3	39.1	20.7	11.5	9.2	4.6	2.3	0.0	2.3
Classes 1965–1969	32	12.5	46.9	21.9	9.4	6.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

The findings in Table MG #9 indicated that

respondents in the modal group, as a whole, came from somewhat smaller families (average number of children 2.75) than did the respondents in the non–modal group (average number of children 2.94); the same was true for respondents in the earlier Classes of the modal group (average number of children 2.84) compared to their classmates in the non–modal group (average number of children 3.06); the relationship was reversed, however, for respondents in the later Classes in which the respondents in the modal group came from slightly larger families (average number of children 2.65) than did the respondents in the non–modal group (average number of children 2.59).

FINANCIAL AID FOR UTCN PROGRAM

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the financial aid they received, if any, while they were students at UTCN (Question 2 Q One) is presented in Table MG #10.

Table MG #10. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Did You Receive Financial Aid While Attending UTCN? Sources			
		UTCN	Other	Employ. Part–time	No.
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%
Total	97	16.5	17.5	9.3	56.7
Classes 1954–1964	52	5.7	15.4	13.5	65.4
Classes 1965–1969	45	28.9	20.0	4.4	46.7
Non–modal Group					
Total	117	11.1	14.5	16.2	58.1
Classes 1954–1964	85	4.7	12.9	17.6	64.7
Classes 1965–1969	32	28.1	18.7	12.5	40.6

The findings presented in Table MG #10 indicated that

there was little difference in the proportion of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups who received financial support from outside their famillities for their education at UTCN despite the fact that the non–modal group probably came from a higher socio–economic group than did the modal group;

*the big increase in the proportion of respondents receiving financial aid from UTCN, from the earlier to the later Classes in both groups, may best be understood as manifesting the significant increase in *federal support availability.*

---

*See Chapter 1, Volume 2, Table Q 2 #3 for availability of funds by calendar year.

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

For the comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the region of their principal residence since graduation see Volume 1 Chapter 7 Table MG #3.

MARITAL STATUS

A comparison of the percent of responses for 5 categories of current marital status for modal and non–modal group respondents (Question 49 Q One and Questions 21 and 22 Q Two) is presented in Tables MG #11 and #12.

Table MG #11. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One

		Marital Status				
		Widowed	Divorced	Separated	Married	Never Married
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	0.0	4.0	2.0	64.0	30.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	0.0	3.8	1.9	66.0	28.3
Classes 1965–1969	47	0.0	4.3	2.1	61.7	31.9
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	0.8	0.0	0.0	93.3	5.9
Classes 1954–1964	87	1.1	0.0	0.0	95.4	3.4
Classes 1965–1969	32	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5

The findings presented in Table MG #11 indicated that

the modal and non–modal groups differed sharply in the proportion of respondents who reported that they had never married and the differences was greatest between the respondents in the earlier Classes of both groups who answered Q One from 3–13 years after graduation;

as was to be expected, the proportion of the non–modal group respondents who reported having married was considerably greater at both 2 years and 3–13 years after graduation than it was for their classmates who had been active in nursing over the same time periods;

the greater proportion of respondents in the modal group, both early and later Classes, than in the non–modal group that reported being divorced and separated is noteworthy; this finding could suggest the greater importance of career as opposed to marriage for respondents in the modal group.

Table MG #12. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q Two

		Marital Status				
		Widowed	Divorced	Separated	Married	Never Married
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	0.0	6.0	0.0	72.0	22.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	0.0	3.8	0.0	*73.6	22.6
G–R Int. 8–18 yrs						
Classes 1965–1969	47	0.0	8.5	0.0	*70.2	21.3
G–R Int 7 years						
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	0.8	1.7	0.0	95.0	2.5
Classes 1954–1964	87	1.1	2.3	0.0	94.3	2.3
G–R Int 8–18 years						
Classes 1965–1969	32	0.0	0.0	0.0	96.9	3.1
G–R Int 7 years						

*One respondent had divorced and remarried in the 5 year period between Q One and Q Two.

The findings presented in Tables MG #11 and #12 indicated that

the proportion of respondents in both the modal and non–modal groups who had never married decreases over the five year period between questionnaires; however, slightly more than 20% of the modal group respondents had never married at periods ranging from 7 to 18 years after graduation whereas only 2.3 to 3.1% of the non–modal respondents reported the same status;

the proportion of modal group respondents who reported being divorced at the time they responded had increased with twice the proportion in the later Classes reporting being divorced at 7 years out of school as had reported it at 2 years out of school;

divorced status was reported on Q Two for the first time among non–modal respondents in the earlier Classes, 8 to 18 years out of school but in small proportions;

A path study from Q One to Q Two of the marital status of respondents in the modal group indicated that

of the 4 respondents who were divorced at the time they answered Q One, 3 had remarried and 1 remained divorced at the time they answered Q Two;

of the 2 who were separated, both were divorced when they answered Q Two;

of the 30 who had not married when they answered Q One, 8 were married when they answered Q Two;

of the 64 respondents who were married, 3 divorced and remained divorced when they answered Q Two while an additional 2 divorced and remarried in the five year period between questionnaires.

A path study from Q One to Q Two of the marital status of respondents in the non–modal group indicated that

the one respondent who was a widow when she answered Q One was remarried when she answered Q Two;

of the 7 respondents who had not married when they answered Q One, 4 had married when they answered Q Two;

of the 111 who were married, 1 was widowed and 2 were divorced when they answered Q Two.

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal group respondents for the time they were first married (Question 51 Q One) is presented in Table MG #13.

Table MG #13. Percent of Responses for Time First Married for Modal and Non–Modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Time of First Marriage	N=70 %	N=38 %	N=32 %	N=112 %	N=84 %	N=28 %
Before first enrollment at UTCN	2.9	0.0	6.3	0.9	1.2	0.0
Before senior year of first enrollment	15.7	21.1	9.4	17.9	17.9	17.9
During senior year of first enrollment	10.0	7.9	12.5	17.0	19.0	10.7
Within one year of graduation from UTCN	38.6	31.6	46.9	34.8	32.1	42.9
From one to three years after graduation	18.6	13.2	*25.0	19.6	16.7	*28.6
More than three years after graduation	14.3	26.3	XX	9.8	13.1	XX
Total	100.1	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1

The findings presented in Table MG #13 indicated that

there was an appreciable difference between the proportions of the respondents in the earlier Classes of the two groups who married before and during enrollment at UTCN; the proportion was greater for the non–modal respondents than for the modal respondents; no such difference eixsted for the respondents in the later Classes;

the proportion of modal group respondents who were first married before they graduated from UTCN was constant from earlier to later Classes, whereas it decreased noticeably among respondents in the non–modal group over time.

---

*These respondents answered Q One two years after graduation.

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the activity of the fiancé at the time of the engagement (Question 52 Q One) is presented in Table MG #14.

Table MG #14. Percent of Responses for Activity of Fiancé at Time of Engagement for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
Activity of Fiancé at Time of Engagement	Total N=70 %	Classes 1954–64 N=38 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %	Total N=111 %	Classes 1954–64 N=84 %	Classes 1965–69 N=27 %
Student at UT Medical Units	14.3	7.9	21.9	41.4	41.7	40.7
Undergraduate at other college	15.7	13.2	18.8	14.4	13.1	18.5
Graduate student	4.3	2.6	6.3	2.7	2.4	3.7
Qualified practitioner in health related field	4.3	5.3	3.1	16.2	14.3	22.2
None of these is applicable	61.4	71.1	50.0	25.2	28.6	14.8
Total	100.0	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.1	99.9

The findings presented in Table MG #14 indicated that

respondents in the non–modal group as a whole and in the 2 Class groups, became engaged to persons who were students at the University of Tennessee Medical Units and persons who were qualified practitioners in health related fields in much higher proportions than did their classmates in the modal group.

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

A comparison of the percent of responses for the modal and non–modal group respondents for each of the age and age of children categories (Question 48 Q One and Question 23 Q Two) is presented in Table A14 Appendix.

The findings of the comparison are presented in Summary Table MG #15. The 16 categories in Table A14 were collapsed into 4 categories in Summary Table MG #15.

Summary Table MG #15. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Age, Marital Status and Age of Children for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Q One and Q Two

Categories of Age, Marital Status and Age of Children	Modal Group				Non–modal Group			
	Q One Responses		Q Two Responses		Q One Responses		Q Two Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never married	30	30.0	22	22.0	7	5.9	2	1.7
Married – no children	38	38.0	17	17.0	26	21.8	3	2.5
All children under 12 Yrs.	32	32.0	48	48.0	85	71.5	83	69.8
All children under 20 and over 3½ years	0	0.0	13	13.0	1	0.8	*31	25.9
Total	100	100.0	100	100.0	119	100.0	119	99.9

The findings presented in summary Table MG #15 indicated that

less than 5% of the non–modal respondents were childless at the time they answered Q Two, 7 to 18 years after graduation whereas almost 40% of the modal group respondents were childless at that time;

among the respondents who had children, the non–modal group had a greater proportion of children than did the modal group in both the younger and the older age brackets;

being unmarried or being childless if married was clearly related to being a member of the modal group;

the writers assumed that the difference in the degree to which respondents in the two groups were employed in nursing (Chapter 7, Volume 1, Table MG #9) was positively associated with these findings.

*Includes 1 child who had left the household

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the number of living children each had (Question 50 Q One) is presented in Table MG #16.

Table MG #16. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Children for Modal and Non–modal. Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Children						
		None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six or more
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	70	57.1	17.1	15.7	8.6	1.4	0.0	0.0
Classes 1954–64	38	36.8	18.4	26.3	15.8	2.6	0.0	0.0
Classes 1965–69	32	81.3	15.6	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non–modal Group								
Total	112	22.3	21.4	31.3	15.2	9.8	0.0	0.0
Classes 1954–64	84	7.0	19.0	40.6	20.2	13.1	0.0	0.0
Classes 1965–69	28	67.9	28.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The average number of living children per respondent for the modal and non–modal respondents by 2 groups of Classes is presented in Table MG #17.

Table MG #17. Average Number of Children per Respondent for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

Modal Group	Respondents N	Children N	Average
Total	70	56	0.80
Classes 1954–1964	38	49	1.28
Classes 1965–1969	32	7	0.21
Non–Modal Group			
Total	112	189	1.68
Classes 1954–1964	84	179	2.10
Classes 1965–1969	28	10	0.35

The findings presented in Tables MG #16 and #17 indicated that, as might be expected, respondents in the non–modal group reported having twice the average number of children that the modal group reported; further, the modal respondents were much more likely than were their non–modal classmates to have no children.

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

A comparison of the percent of responses from ever married modal and non–modal respondents regarding the husband's occupation (Question 55 Q One) is presented in Table MG #18.

Table MG #18. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Husband's Occupation	N=60 %	N=32 %	N=28 %	N=99 %	N=74 %	N=25 %
Profession	41.7	43.8	39.3	77.9	78.4	76.0
Business official	13.3	12.5	14.3	9.1	9.5	8.0
Salesman	8.3	6.3	10.7	3.0	2.7	4.0
Clerical worker	5.0	9.4	0.0	2.0	2.7	0.0
Technician, semi-professional worker	11.7	15.6	7.1	2.0	2.7	0.0
Service worker	3.3	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student	16.7	12.5	21.4	5.1	2.7	12.0
Farm owner	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.4	0.0
Total	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.1	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #18 indicated that

the difference in the proportion of husbands in the category of professions between modal and non–modal respondents was striking; furthermore, it was noteworthy that professions was the only category in which the proportion of husbands of non–modal respondents was greater than the proportion of husbands of modal respondents;

the proportion of husbands of modal respondents was greater than that for husbands of non–modal respondentss in all the other occupational categories with the exception of the category of service workers for the Classes of 1954 to 1964 and clerical workers for the Classes of 1965 to 1969; for these two categories and these two Class groups, there was no difference in the proportion of responses.

A comparison of the percent of responses from ever married modal and non–modal respondents who reported that their husband's occupation was a profession, by 7 categories of professions, is presented in Table MG #19.

Table MG #19. Percent of Responses for Husband's Profession for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
Husband's Profession	Total N=25 %	Classes 1954–64 N=14 %	Classes 1965–69 N=11 %	Total N=77 %	Classes 1954–64 N=58 %	Classes 1965–69 N=19 %
Physician	16.0	7.1	27.3	61.0	67.2	42.1
Dentist	12.0	21.4	0.0	10.4	10.3	10.5
Pharmacist	8.0	7.1	9.1	10.4	5.2	26.3
Teacher	24.0	35.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Engineer	12.0	14.3	9.1	3.9	5.2	0.0
Minister	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.7	5.3
Other, including not specified	*28.0	14.3	45.5	**11.7	10.3	15.8
Total	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #19 indicated that

there was no difference in the proportion of responses from the total modal and non–modal groups for the professions of dentist, pharmacist, engineer and minister as followed by husbands;

the differences in the proportion of responses from the total groups indicated a greater proportion of responses from the modal group for husbands in the teacher category and the "other" category while there was a greater proportion of responses from the non–modal group for husbands in the physician category;

the differences in the proportion of responses from the Classes 1954 to 1964 indicated a greater proportion of responses from the modal group for husbands in the dentist, teacher, engineer and "other" categories while there was a greater proportion of responses from the non–modal group for husbands in the physician category;

there was a slightly smaller difference between the proportion of modal and non–modal respondents who identified husbands who were physicians in the later Classes than was the case for the earlier Classes.

* one respondent did not specify a particular profession. 1 each specified systems analyst, accountant, optometrist, bacteriologist, assistant professor and pilot.

**one respondent did not specify a particular profession. 1 each specified government career man, optometrist, biochemist, chemist, real estate appraiser, air force officer and air force pilot.

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTION

CAREER CHOICE

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the factor that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career (Question 57 Q One) is presented in Table MG #20.

Table MG #20. Percent of Responses for Factor that Most Influenced Choice of Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	N=96 %	N=49 %	N=47 %	N=119 %	N=87 %	N=32 %
Parents or immediate relatives	21.9	20.4	23.4	29.4	24.1	43.8
Teachers (at any level)	3.1	6.1	0.0	1.7	1.1	3.1
Someone in the field nursing	8.3	2.0	14.9	9.2	12.6	0.0
Military experience	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Financial pressures	1.0	0.0	2.1	1.7	2.3	0.0
Summer job in hospital or health related field	5.2	0.0	10.6	8.4	5.7	15.6
Active recruitment on part of nursing (e.g. brochures, etc.)	2.1	4.1	0.0	5.9	5.7	6.3
Someone in general health field (e.g. doctor, dentist)	12.5	12.2	12.8	5.9	6.9	3.1
Other (specify)	17.7	22.4	12.8	15.1	18.4	6.3
Don't know	28.1	32.7	23.4	22.7	23.0	21.9
Total	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.1

The factors that respondents in the two groups specified when they marked the "other" option are listed below;

Factors Specified Under "Other" Responses as Important to Modal and Non–Modal Respondents in Choice of Nursing as Career

Modal Group Responses N	"Other" Factors	Non–modal Group Responses N
7	Personal desire to be a nurse	10
3	Service to humanity, interest in health and science	2
2	Call to serve God	1
1	Recruitment by a mission board	0
1	Desire to study medicine, insufficient funds	0
1	Illness of self, death in family	2
1	Parents in home where she sat with children	0
0	Books about nursing	1
1	Employment opportunity and security	2
17		18

The findings presented in Table MG #20 indicated that

approximately one quarter of the respondents in each group were unable to identify a single factor from among the options that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career; this uncertainty was most evident among respondents in the earlier Classes in the modal group and least evident among respondents in the later Classes in the non–modal group;

approximately one quarter of the respondents in each group identified parents or close relatives as the most important influence in their choice of nursing as a career; in the later Classes in the non–modal group, parents and close relatives accounted for nearly 45% of responses;

respondents in the modal group identified someone in nursing and someone in the general health field more frequently (20.8% of responses) than did the respondents in the non–modal group (15.1% of responses); it is worthy of note that a comparison of responses from members of the later Classes in each group indicated that 27.7% of the modal group respondents compared to 3.1% of the non–modal group respondents identified these health professionals as the factor that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career;

active recruitment on the part of nursing was identified by a small proportion of respondents in each group and it is worthy of note that among respondents in the later Classes, the modal group respondents did not identify it at all;

among the respondents who marked the "other" option (approximately 16% of each group) the factor that was most frequently specified was a personal desire to be a nurse, with religious and humanitarian motives ranking next in frequency.

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding their perceptions of attitudes held by lower, middle and upper classes of the general public in relation to nursing as a career (Question 58 Q One and Question 27 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #21.

Responses were given decreasing values, from 5 to 1, for attitudes perceived as very favorable, favorable, indifferent, unfavorable and very unfavorable.

Table MG #21. Average Values for Most to Least Favorable Attitude Toward Nursing as Career as Perceived by Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One and Q Two

		General Public					
		Lower Class		Middle Class		Upper Class	
Modal Group	N	Q One AV Value	Q Two AV Value	Q One AV Value	Q Two AV Value	Q One AV Value	Q Two AV Value
Total	99	4.49	4.48	4.00	4.13	3.15	3.25
Classes 1954–64	52	4.36	4.44	3.96	4.19	3.19	3.33
Classes 1965–69	47	4.63	4.53	4.04	4.06	3.10	3.17
Non–modal Group							
Total	114	4.35	4.35	4.22	4.31	3.31	3.49
Classes 1954–64	83	4.34	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.28	3.54
Classes 1965–69	31	4.38	4.32	4.21	4.32	3.34	3.36

The findings presented in Table MG #21 indicated that

although all the averages calculated for responses from the modal and non–modal respondents fell between values of 5 (very favorable) and 3 (indifferent), the distribution of the average values along this continuum indicated some differences in perception of attitudes between the two major groups, the two subgroups in each and the responses to Q One and Q Two;

there was a greater range between the most favorable attitudes perceived for the lower class and the least favorable perceived for the upper class among modal group respondents than among non–modal group respondents; the maximum range was recorded by modal group members in Classes 1964 to 1969 whose average rating for lower class perceptions was nearer to very favorable than it was to just favorable and whose average rating for upper class perceptions was closer to indifferent than to favorable;

the members of the modal group perceived the attitude of the lower class to be more favorable toward a career in nursing than did the members of the non–modal group; the most favorable perception was that of the modal group members in Classes 1965 to 1969;

the members of the non–modal group perceived the middle and upper classes to have more favorable attitudes toward nursing as a career than did the members of the modal group; the least favorable rating perceived for the upper class was reported by the modal group members in Classes 1965 to 1969;

there was no change in perception of lower class attitudes from Q One to Q Two for the total groups; there was, however, a slight shift toward perception of more favorable attitudes on the part of the middle and upper classes, for the total groups from Q One to Q Two;

the one subgroup that recorded a shift toward perception of less favorable attitudes from Q One to Q Two was the modal group members in Classes 1965 to 1969 in their interpretation of lower class attitudes;

the subgroups that recorded the greatest shifts toward perceptions of more favorable attitudes between Q One and Q Two were the modal group members in Classes 1954 to 1964 in their interpretation of middle class attitudes and the non–modal group members in Classes 1954 to 1964 in their interpretation of upper class attitudes.

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the most important nursing position they ever held (Question 24 Q One) by title of position is presented in Table MG #22.

Table MG #22. Percent of Responses for Type of Most Important Nursing Position for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Grad.–Resp. Intervals		Total	Grad.–Resp. Intervals	
		3–13 years	2 years		3–13 years	2 years
Most Important Nursing Position Ever Held	N=93 %	N=47 %	N=46 %	N=100 %	N=72 %	N=28 %
Staff or general duty nurse	34.4	12.8	56.5	48.0	37.5	75.0
Head nurse or assistant	11.8	12.8	10.9	11.0	12.5	7.1
Supervisor nurse or assistant	10.8	14.9	6.5	5.0	5.6	3.6
Nursing administrator or assistant	5.4	8.5	2.2	1.0	0.0	3.6
Nursing consultant	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.6
Nursing instructor or assistant	24.7	34.0	15.2	29.0	37.5	7.1
Nursing education administrator or assistant	4.3	8.5	0.0	2.0	2.8	0.0
Clinical specialist	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.8	0.0
Other	6.5	6.4	6.5	1.0	1.4	0.0
Total	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #22 indicated that

a greater proportion of respondents in the modal group than in the non–modal group, answering at 2 years out of school, were able to identify as important, positions above the staff nurse level in nursing service and instructor in nursing education positions;

in the period 3 to 13 years out of school, the modal group respondents identified as important, positions as supervisors and administrators in nursing service and administrators in nursing education to a greater degree than did respondents in the non–modal group;

a possible explanation put forward by the writers for the fact that 75% of the non–modal respondents who answered 2 years out of school, identified the staff nurse position as the most important they had ever held, was that it may have been the only position they held in this short period since graduation.

CAREER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the relative importance of 6 reasons for present employment, excluding financial reasons, (Question 30 Q One) is presented in Table MG #23.

A common base for comparing the degrees of importance was developed by assigning 6 points to first place in importance, 5 points to second place and so on down to 1 point for sixth place in importance. The total points, percent of aggregate points and mean rank derived from each of the 6 reasons, for modal and non–modal respondents, by 2 graduation response intervals are presented in Table MG #23.

Table MG #23. Percent of Aggregate Points and Mean Rank for Responses to 6 Reasons (Non Financial) for Present Employment for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Reasons for Present Employment (non financial)	Modal Group G–R Interval 2 years N = Max 46 Points	%	Mean Rank	G–R Interval 3–13 years N = Max 49 Points	%	Mean Rank
Career commitment	133	14.2	3.16	150	15.6	3.57
Job satisfaction	185	19.8	4.20	225	23.4	4.59
People I meet	137	14.7	3.18	119	12.4	2.90
Service to others	195	20.9	4.33	201	20.9	4.36
Personal fulfillment	223	23.9	4.84	222	23.1	4.93
Scholarship commitment	61	6.5	1.45	43	4.5	1.10
Total	934	100.0		960	99.9	

Reasons for Present Employment (non financial)	Non–modal Group G–R Interval 2 years N = Max 22 Points	%	Mean Rank	G–R Interval 3–13 years N = Max 19 Points	%	Mean Rank
Career commitment	67	14.7	3.35	28	9.3	2.80
Job satisfaction	77	16.8	3.50	64	21.2	4.57
People I meet	62	13.6	2.95	47	15.6	3.35
Service to others	101	22.1	4.57	66	21.9	4.40
Personal fulfillment	117	25.6	5.31	87	28.8	5.43
Scholarship commitment	33	7.2	1.73	10	3.3	1.11
Total	457	100.0		302	100.1	

The findings presented in Table MG #23 indicated that

respondents in both modal and non–modal groups ranked personal fulfillment first as their reason (non financial) for being employed in nursing when they answered Q One;

second ranked by modal group respondents was job satisfaction, by non–modal group respondents it was service to others; these two reasons changed places between the two groups for third rank;

fourth, fifth and sixth ranks were assigned by respondents in both groups to career commitment, the people I meet and scholarship/traineeship commitment in that order;

the only reason that was rated higher by the 3–13 year modal subgroup than by the 3–13 non–modal subgroup was career commitment by 0.77 mean points;

the reasons the 3–13 year non–modal subgroup rated higher than did the 3–13 year modal subgroup were the people I meet by 0.45 mean points and personal fulfillment by 0.5 mean points;

the differences in ratings for job satisfaction, service to others and scholarship/traineeship commitment were negligible for the members of the 2 groups that were 3–13 years out of school;

the reasons that the 2 year modal subgroup rated higher than the 2 year non–modal subgroup did were job satisfaction by 0.70 mean points and the people I meet by 0.23 mean points;

the reasons that the 2 year non–modal subgroup rated higher than the 2 year modal subgroup did were career commitment by 0.19 mean points, service to others by 0.26 mean points, personal fulfillment by 0.47 mean points and scholarship/traineeship commitment by 0.28 mean points.

The writers suggested caution in interpretation of these findings because of the limited N in the non–modal sample, particularly in the 3–13 year sub–group.

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding how attractive to them, work in nursing was, compared to work in other fields (Question 59 Q One and Question 28 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #24.

A point system, on a scale of 5 down to 1 for most to least attractive, was used to calculate average values. The options were "much more attractive", "more attractive", "about the same", "less attractive" and "much less attractive".

Table MG #24. Average Points for Attractiveness of Work in Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes, Q One and Q Two

	Average Point Values for Attractiveness of Work in Nursing	
	Q One	Q Two
Modal Group N=100		
Total	3.33	3.54
Classes 1954–64 N=53	3.58	3.70
Classes 1965-69 N=47	3.04	3.36
Non–modal Group N=116		
Total	3.25	3.38
Classes 1954–64 N=84	3.00	3.50
Classes 1965–69 N=32	3.31	3.06

The findings presented in Table MG #24 indicated that

although the average ratings for both groups on both questionnaires fell between 3.00 (about the same) and 4.00 (more attractive), the ratings of the modal group were more favorable than were those of the non–modal group;

the ratings by respondents in both groups and all sub groups were more favorable on Q Two than on Q One with one exception, namely, work in nursing compared to work in other fields appeared less attractive on Q Two than it had been on Q One to the respondents in the later Classes of the non–modal group;

the highest rating for the attractiveness of work in nursing compared to work in other fields was given by the modal group respondents in the earlier Classes on Q Two when they were 8 to 18 years out of school.

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents for the likelihood that they would choose nursing as a career again (Question 60 Q One and Question 29 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #25.

Table MG #25. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again							
		Definitely No		Probably No		Probably Yes		Definitely Yes	
Modal Group	N	Q One %	Q Two %	Q One %	Q Two %	Q One %	Q Two %	Q One %	Q Two %
Total	100	2.0	2.0	18.0	12.2	39.0	37.8	41.0	48.0
Classes 1954–64	53	1.9	1.9	9.4	5.8	33.9	36.5	54.7	55.8
Classes 1965–69	47	2.1	2.2	27.7	19.6	44.7	39.1	25.5	39.1
Non–modal Group									
Total	116	1.7	0.9	10.3	14.5	42.2	42.7	45.7	41.8
Classes 1954–64	85	2.4	1.2	9.4	15.3	38.8	38.8	49.4	44.7
Classes 1965–69	31	0.0	0.0	12.9	12.5	51.6	53.1	35.5	34.4

The findings presented in Table MG #25 indicated that

knowing what they knew when they answered the questionnaires, the respondents in both groups would choose nursing again in a better than 4 to 1 ratio;

however, this ratio was reduced to 2 to 1 in the later modal group Classes on Q One, just two years after graduation; the response was less negative for these same respondents on Q Two, seven years after graduation;

there is considerably less difference in the responses of the two Class groupings in the modal group and on the two questionnaries than among their non–modal classmates.

The alternative careers that were specified (Question 30 Q Two) by respondents in the modal and non–modal groups who stated that they definitely or probably would not choose nursing if they had the choice to make again were:

	Modal Group Responses N	Non–modal Group Responses N
Teaching	1	2
Business office	2	2
Social work	1	3
Medicine	4	1
Physical therapy	0	3
Occupational therapy	0	1
Dental hygiene	0	1
Medical research	0	1
Veterinary medicine	1	0
Personnel work	1	0
Psychology	0	1
Home economics	1	0
Mathematics	1	0
Linguistics	1	0
Interpreter	1	0
Foreign service	1	0
Art	1	2
Antiques	1	0
Interior design	0	1
Total	17	18

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the husband's attitude toward her employment as a nurse (Question 54 Q One) is presented in Table MG #26.

Table MG #26. Percent of Responses for 5 Attitudes of Husband Re Employment as a Nurse for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One

		Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse				
		Strongly Favors	Approves	Indifferent	Discourages	Opposes
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	*57	42.1	47.4	5.3	3.5	1.8
Classes 1954–1964	30	33.3	50.0	6.7	6.7	3.3
Classes 1965–1969	27	51.9	44.4	3.7	0.0	0.0
Non–modal Group						
Total	**87	20.7	46.0	8.0	17.2	8.0
Classes 1954–1964	63	12.7	47.6	7.9	22.2	9.5
Classes 1965–1969	24	41.7	41.7	8.3	4.2	4.2

*30 respondents who had never married were ineligible to answer Q 54. 13 who were eligible (18.6%) did not respond.

**7 respondents who had never married were ineligible to answer Q 54. 25 who were eligible (23.3%) did not respond.

The findings presented in Table MG #26 indicated that

in general, the ever married respondents in the modal group perceived their husbands as having more favorable attitudes toward their employment as nurses than was the case with respondents in the non–modal group;

the difference between the perceptions of respondents in the later Classes was less marked between modal and non–modal respondents than it was for those in the earlier Classes.

When the modal group respondents answered Question 22 Q Two, eight of them had married for the first time in the interval since Q One. Seven of them reported the attitudes they perceived their husbands to hold toward their employment as nurses; four strongly favored it and three approved it.

Five modal group respondents had married for a second time in the interval since they answered Q One; three of their husbands strongly favored their employment as nurses and two approved it.

When the attitudes of the 12 additional husbands identified on Q Two were added to those of the 57 husbands identified by modal group respondents on Q One, the proportions of responses were as follows:

Strongly favors	44.9%
Approves	46.4%
Indifferent	4.3%
Discourages	2.9%
Opposes	1.4%

Forty modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had remained the same (Question 25 Q Two) over the interval between Q One and Q Two. The proportions for these unchanged attitudes were as follows:

Strongly favors	45.0%
Approves	52.5%
Indifferent	2.5%

Six modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had changed between Q One and Q Two. The changes were:

one from favorable to unfavorable
four from unfavorable to favorable
one from indifferent to favorable

When the non–modal group respondents answered Question 22 Q Two, four of them had married for the first time in the interval between Q One and Q Two. One of them reported that her husband discouraged her employment as a nurse, while the remaining three did not answer Question 22 Q Two.

One non–modal group respondent reported that she had married for a second time in the interval between Q One and Q Two; she reported that her husband discouraged her employment as a nurse.

As would be expected, the addition of the responses for these two non–modal group respondents to the findings presented in Table MG #26 did not alter them appreciably.

Sixty–two non–modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had remained unchanged (Question 25 Q Two) over the interval between Q One and Q Two. The proportions for these unchanged attitudes were as follows:

Strongly favors	24.2%
Approves	46.8%
Indifferent	4.8%
Discourages	17.7%
Opposes	6.5%

Seventeen non–modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had changed between Q One and Q Two. The changes were:

seven from favorable to unfavorable
six from unfavorable to favorable
three from indifferent to favorable
one from indifferent to unfavorable

LASTING FRIENSHIPS AMONG RESPONDENTS

A comparison of the responses of modal and non–modal respondents regarding the number of classmates with whom they had maintained friendships since graduation (Question 56 Q One) is presented in Table MG #27.

Table MG #27. Percent of Responses for Number of Classmates Counted as Friends for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of UTCN Classmates Counted as Friends								
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight- or More	None
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	99	4.0	11.1	7.1	10.1	20.2	19.2	8.1	17.2	3.0
Classes 1954–64	52	5.8	9.6	9.6	13.5	7.7	23.1	7.7	19.2	3.8
Classes 1965–69	47	2.1	12.8	4.3	6.4	34.0	14.9	8.5	14.9	2.1
Non–modal Group										
Total	118	5.9	10.2	14.4	12.7	11.9	7.6	4.2	27.1	5.9
Classes 1954–64	87	6.9	11.5	13.8	12.6	10.3	6.9	5.7	27.6	4.6
Classes 1965–69	31	3.2	6.5	16.1	12.9	16.1	9.7	0.0	25.8	9.7

The findings presented in Table MG #27 indicated that

in general and in the two Class groupings, respondents in the modal group counted larger numbers of their former classmates as friends at the time they answer Q One than was the case for respondents in the non–modal group;

this difference was more noticeable among respondents in the later Classes than in the earlier Classes.

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

POST BACCALAUREATE EDUCATION

A comparison of the responses of the modal and non–modal respondents regarding having earned a master's degree since graduation from UTCN (Question 10 Q One, Question 14 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #28.

There were 37 master's degrees reported in the combined responses to Q One and Q Two by modal respondents, two of whom reported two master's degrees each. One additional modal respondent reported a master's degree but did not indicate a major. Three modal respondents each reported holding a doctorate, one in education, one in philosophy and one in juris prudence.

There were 10 master's degrees reported in the combined responses to Q One and Q Two by non–modal respondents.

Table MG #28. Number of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Reporting Master's Degrees, by Major and by Class

Class	G–R Int	Modal Group Master's Degrees		Non–modal Group Master's Degrees	
		Q One Nursing Majors N	Q Two Non–Nursing Majors N	Q One Nursing Majors N	Q Two Non–Nursing Majors N
1954	18	1	3	1	0
1955	17	1	0	0	0
1956	16	3	1	1	0
1957	15	0	2	0	1
1958	14	1	1	0	0
1959	13	2	1	0	1
1960	12	1	0	0	0
1961	11	0	1	0	0
1962	10	4	0	0	0
1963	9	0	0	0	0
1964	8	0	1	2	1
1965	7	2	0	0	0
1966	7	2	0	0	1
1967	7	0	1	0	0
1968	7	5	1	0	0
1969	7	2	1	2	0
Total		24	13	6	4

There were 50 master's degrees reported by all the generic program respondents in the Classes 1954 through 1964 including those with a major in nursing (N=31) and non nursing (N=19). (See Table Q 10 #18 Chapter 2 Volume 1)

There were 47 master's degrees reported by the modal and non–modal respondents in these same Classes. There were, therefore, 3 of the 50 master's degrees (6%) that were reported by generic program respondents who qualified for neither the modal nor the non–modal group.

A comparison of the findings presented in Table MG #28 with those in Table Q 10 #18 indicated that

the modal group respondents accounted for 24 of the 31 (77.4%) of the master's degrees with majors in nursing that were reported by all the generic program respondents in the Classes 1954 through 1969; however, they accounted for only 12 of the 19 (63.2%) of the masters degrees with non nursing majors reported by the same segment of the total population;

the non–modal respondents accounted for 2 of the 31 (19.4%) of the master's degrees with nursing majors and 4 of the 19 (21.1%) of the master's degrees with non nursing majors that were reported by all the generic program respondents in the Classes 1954 through 1969.

The obvious inference from these findings was that there was more likelihood that respondents who hold the master's degree, and more specifically a master's degree with a major in nursing, would follow continuous careers in nursing than was the case for their classmates who held master's degrees with non nursing majors or did not hold the master's degree.

HONOR SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP

No meaningful conclusions could be drawn from a comparison of the small number of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups who reported membership in honor societies. Because of the time factor described in the interpretation of the findings in Table Q 67 #3, Chapter 5 Volume 2, all members of the modal and non–modal groups had graduated prior to the establishment of the local honor society, Upsilon Tau in 1970 and the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau, the national honor society of nursing in 1972.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning membership status in the American Nurses' Association (Question 61 Q One) is presented in Table MG #29.

Table MG #29. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		ANA Membership Status		
Modal Group	N	Currently Member %	Previously Member %	Never Member %
Total	100	54.0	28.0	18.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	54.7	39.6	5.7
Classes 1965–1969	47	53.2	14.9	31.9
Non–Modal Group				
Total	119	10.1	56.3	33.6
Classes 1954–1964	87	5.7	62.1	32.2
Classes 1965–1969	32	21.9	40.6	37.5

The findings presented in Table MG #29 indicated that

as was to be expected, respondents in the modal group were members of ANA, at the time they answered Q One, at a considerably higher rate than was the case for respondents in the non–modal group; also expected was the fact that the sharpest difference in this rate was evident among members of the earlier Classes;

the difference in the rate of membership among respondents in the later Classes in the two groups, was also considerable; two years after graduation, when less in the way of differences would be expected, there was evidence that, although the proportion of respondents in both groups that had ever been members in the two year period was relatively equal, the proportion that maintained current membership at the end of the two year period in the modal group was almost two and a half times that in the non–modal group.

The writers suggest that this criterion of professionalism has potential as an indicator of the proportion of any group of relatively new graduates who may be expected to engage in continuous careers in nursing.

A comparison of responses of the modal and non–modal respondents who had even been members of ANA, concerning the degree of their participation at local, state and national levels of the organization (Question 62 Q One) is presented in Table MG #30.

Table MG #30. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at 3 Levels, by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total N=*82 %	Classes 1954–64 N=50 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %	Total N=*79 %	Classes 1954–64 N=59 %	Classes 1965–69 N=20 %
Levels of ANA and Degrees of Participation						
Local Level						
Leadership, officer, committee chairman	17.1	22.0	9.4	6.3	8.5	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	26.8	28.0	25.0	15.2	18.6	5.0
Minimal, pay dues, occasionally attend	56.1	50.0	65.6	78.5	72.9	95.0
State Level						
Leadership, officer, committee chairman	3.7	6.0	0.0	1.3	1.7	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	11.0	14.0	6.3	6.3	8.5	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend.	85.4	80.0	93.8	92.4	89.8	100.0
National Level						
Leadership, officer, committee chairman	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.7	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	1.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend	98.8	98.0	100.0	98.7	98.3	100.0

*Only those respondents who were currently or had been previously members of ANA Q One.

The findings presented in Table MG #30 indicated that

as was to be expected, the participation of respondents in both groups at the national level of ANA was minimal; the differences in the degree of participation between respondents in the earlier Classes of the two groups is evident at the state organization level but to an even greater extent at the local level; the differences in the degrees of participation of respondents in the later Classes was consistent with the findings presented in Table MG #29 (ANA Membership Status) and could be used to enhance the value of continued membership as a tool to predict the likelihood of continuous activity in nursing.

On Q Two, thirty–four modal group respondents reported being active in ANA during the five year interval between questionnaires:

twenty of them (59%) were officers, chairmen of committees or active otherwise in the local association,
thirteen of them (38%) were similarly active at the state level and
one respondent (3%) was chairman of a national committee.

Only two non–modal respondents reported any degree of activity at any level of ANA on Q Two.

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning membership status in the National League for Nursing (Question 63 Q One) is presented in Table MG #31.

Table MG #31. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		NLN Membership Status		
Modal Group	N	Current Membership %	Previous Membership %	Never a Member %
Total	100	18.0	14.0	68.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	30.2	24.5	45.3
Classes 1965–1969	47	4.3	2.1	93.6
Non–modal Group				
Total	119	2.5	21.0	76.5
Classes 1954–1964	87	3.4	28.7	67.8
Classes 1965–1969	32	0.0	0.0	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #31 indicated that,

as was to be expected, the over all membership in NLN was considerably less than it was in ANA (Table MG #29);

the rate of membership in NLN in the modal group was higher than it was in the non–modal group and the sharpest difference was for current membership among respondents in the earlier Classes in the two groups;

the proportion of respondents in the later Classes who had even been members of NLN was too small to warrant comparisons.

A comparison of responses for the modal and non–modal respondents who had even been members of NLN, concerning the degree of their participation at local, state and national levels of the organization (Question 63 Q One) is presented in Table MG #32.

Table MG #32. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at 3 Levels, by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
	N=*32	N=29	N=3	N=*28	N=28	N=0
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Levels of NLN and Degrees of Participation						
Local Level						
Leadership, officer committee chairman	12.5	13.8	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	21.9	24.1	0.0	17.9	17.9	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend	65.6	62.1	100.0	75.0	75.0	0.0
State Level						
Leadership, officer committee chairman	12.5	13.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Active, attend meetings, serve on committees	12.5	13.8	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend	75.0	72.4	100.0	85.7	85.7	0.0
National Level						
Leadership, officer committee chairman	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	3.1	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minimal, pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	96.8	96.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

*Only those respondents who were currently or had been previously members of NLN Q One.

The findings presented in Table MG #32 indicated that

as was to be expected, members of the non–modal group reported no activity at the national level of NLN and the only respondents in the modal group who reported participation at the national level were members of the earlier Classes; their participation was to a minimal degree or slightly above;

members of the earlier Classes in the modal group recorded a greater degree of participation in local and state levels of NLN than did their classmates in the non–modal group;

members of the later Classes in the modal group recorded participation slightly above the minimal degree at the local and state levels of the organization while members of the later Classes in the non–modal group reported no membership.

A comparison of the findings presented in Tables MG #29 and MG #31 (membership status in ANA and NLN) indicated that

as was to be expected, in general, there was a higher rate of current and previous membershp in ANA than in NLN among the modal group respondents than among non–modal group respondents; this was true for the total groups and for the two groups of Classes.

No comparison of the findings presented in Tables MG #30 and MG #32 (degrees of participation in three levels of ANA and NLN) was made due to the small number of respondents who were members of NLN.

On Q Two, seven modal group respondents reported being active in NLN during the five year period between questionnaires. Three participated actively at local level, four at the state level and none at the national level.

No non–modal respondents reported being active in NLN on Q Two.

A comparison of responses regarding membership in *other professional organizations (excluding ANA and NLN, Question 65 Q One) for modal and non–modal respondents is presented in Table MG #33.

Table MG #33. Percent of Responses for Membership in Other Professional Organizations for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Other Membership				
		One	Two	Three	Four and More	None
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	13.0	6.0	1.0	0.0	80.0
Classes 1954–64	53	17.0	9.4	1.9	0.0	71.7
Classes 1965–69	47	8.5	2.1	0.0	0.0	89.4
Non–Modal Group						
Total	119	14.3	1.7	1.7	0.0	82.4
Classes 1954–64	87	10.3	2.3	2.3	0.0	85.1
Classes 1965–69	32	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0

The findings presented in Table MG 33 indicated that

the proportion of modal and non–modal respondents reporting membership in other professional organizations was relatively equal;

however, the proportion of respondents in the earlier Classes that reported membership in one and two other professional organizations was considerably higher for modal respondents than for non–modal respondents;

the situation was reversed for respondents in the later Classes in the two groups.

---

*Examples of such organizations given on Q One were: National Education Association, American Hospital Association, American Public Health Association.

A comparison of the responses of modal and non–modal respondents concerning the degree of participation reported in other professional organizations (Question 66 Q One) is presented in Table MG #34.

Table MG #34. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation of Modal and Non–modal Respondents in Other Professional Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes

		Degrees of Participation		
Modal Group	N	Leadership %	Active %	Minimal %
Total	*20	15.0	20.0	65.0
Classes 1954–64	15	20.0	20.0	60.0
Classes 1965–69	5	0.0	20.0	80.0
Non–modal Group				
Total	*21	0.0	33.3	66.7
Classes 1954–64	13	0.0	46.2	53.8
Classes 1965–69	8	0.0	12.5	87.5

The findings presented in Table MG #34 indicated that

in general, modal group respondents reported a greater degree of participation in other professional organizations than did their non–modal classmates;

the respondents in the earlier Classes in both groups participated to a greater degree than did those in the later Classes;

only in the earlier Classes of the modal group did any respondents participate at the leadership level in other professional organizations.

---

*Only those respondents who reported being members of other professional organizations.

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning membership in *voluntary health and welfare organizations (Question 68 Q One) is presented in Table MG #35.

Table MG #35. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes

		Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations				
Modal Group	N	None %	One %	Two %	Three %	Four or more %
Total	99	69.7	23.2	5.0	1.0	1.0
Classes 1954–64	52	63.5	28.8	5.8	0.0	1.9
Classes 1965–69	47	76.6	17.0	4.3	2.1	0.0
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	72.3	10.1	11.8	4.2	1.7
Classes 1954–64	87	70.1	11.5	11.5	4.6	2.3
Classes 1965–69	32	78.1	6.3	12.5	3.1	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #35 indicated that

the proportion of modal respondents who held membership in one voluntary health and welfare organization was greater than for their non–modal classmates; however, the proportion of them that held memberships in two and more such organizations was less than for their non–modal classmates.

---

*Examples of such organizations given on Q One were: Cancer Society, Heart Association, hospital board, Mental Health Association.

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

A comparison of responses of modal and non–modal respondents regarding their membership in voluntary community organizations such as religious, political, civic or educational groups (Question 69 Q One) is presented in Table MG #36.

Table MG #36. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes

		Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations				
		None	One	Two	Three	Four or More
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	38.0	35.0	21.0	5.0	1.0
Classes 1954–64	53	34.0	35.8	22.6	5.7	1.9
Classes 1965–69	47	42.6	34.0	19.1	4.3	0.0
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	27.7	33.6	19.3	11.8	7.6
Classes 1954–64	87	23.0	27.6	23.0	16.1	10.3
Classes 1965–69	32	40.6	50.0	9.4	0.0	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #36 indicated that

the proportion of respondents in both groups that held memberships in one and two voluntary community organizations was similar; the differences appeared among those who held memberships in three and more such organizations; among them the proportion of responses for non–modal respondents was more than twice what it was for the modal respondents;

the tendency for members of the earlier Classes to have more involvement in community organizations than was the case for members of the later Classes, in both groups, was to be expected on the basis of the longer graduation–response intervals for the earlier Classes.

PROFESSION JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning the number of nursing journals to which they subscribed (Question 70 Q One) is presented in Table MG #37.

Table MG #37. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Journal Subscriptions by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Subscriptions to Nursing Journals			
Modal Group	N	None %	One %	Two %	Three or more %
Total	100	32.0	46.0	17.0	5.0
Classes 1954–64	53	30.2	41.5	20.8	7.5
Classes 1965–69	47	34.0	51.1	12.8	2.1
Non–modal Group					
Total	119	67.2	27.7	5.0	0.0
Classes 1954–64	87	78.2	19.5	2.3	0.0
Classes 1965–69	32	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #37 indicated that

as was to be expected, although the rate at which modal and non–modal respondents in the later Classes subscribed to nursing journals was similar, it differed markedly in the earlier Classes, in which the rate for the modal respondents was more than three times that for the non–modal respondents.

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS, PUBLIC ADDRESSES, PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCH PROJECTS

A comparison of the percent of the modal and non–modal respondents who reported activities in consultations, public speaking, publication and research (Question 71 Q One and Questions 32 through 35 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #38.

Table MG #38. Percent of Respondents in Modal and Non–modal Groups Reporting Professional Activities by 2 Groups of Classes, Q One and Q Two

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Professional Activities	N=100 %	N=53 %	N=47 %	N=119 %	N=87 %	N=32 %
Consultations	18.0	17.0	19.0	5.9	5.7	6.3
Public addresses	33.0	28.3	38.3	14.3	12.6	18.7
Publications	9.0	3.8	14.9	0.8	1.1	0.0
Research projects	5.0	7.5	2.1	2.5	2.3	3.1
None of these	35.0	43.4	25.7	76.5	78.3	71.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #38 indicated that

the professional activity in which both groups of respondents reported the most activity was public speaking;

as was to be expected, the proportion of modal respondents reporting participation in each of the four activities was greater than was the case for the non–modal respondents; this was true for the total population of each group and for the 2 Class groupings as well.

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

The opportunity to criticize Q Two (Question 39 Q Two) was utilized by a greater proportion of non–modal respondents (14%) than modal respondents (9%). Suggestions for improvement of the questionnaire were made by a very small proportion in each group; non–modal (3%) and modal (1%).

Only one non–modal respondent (0.8%) requested a report of the findings of the study, while 9 of the modal respondents (9%) made the same request.

Suggestions for improvement in the ways the College and the Alumnae Association could be more useful to respondents (Question 40 Q Two) were made by a greater proportion of non–modal respondents (28%) than modal respondents (17%). Half the suggestions from modal respondents were directed to the College and related to educational needs of the respondents, master's programs, while the suggestions made by the non–modal respondents were more heavily weighted with requests for non educational alumnae services.

The opportunity to identify things that were significant to them (Question 38 Q Two) that the questionnaire did not include was utilized by a higher proportion of non–modal respondents (23%) than modal respondents (7%); the things identified by modal respondents related to honors, awards, courses taken, professional contributions made while the things identified by non–modal respondents related to their lives as persons, not as employed nurses.

SUMMARY

Some of the major findings presented in Chapter 6 are summarized below:

The families of the respondents in the modal group represented a lower socio–economic class, on the basis of the level of education completed by the father and the occupation of the father, than did the families of the respondents in the non–modal group.

The mothers of modal respondents were employed outside the home to a greater degree than was the case with the mothers of the non–modal respondents; the level of education completed by mothers of modal respondents was higher than it was for mothers of non–modal respondents.

The families of modal respondents were slightly smaller, on the average, than those of the non–modal respondents.

Respondents in the non–modal group married earlier, married in greater numbers and remained married in greater numbers than was the case with respondents in the modal group.

Respondents in the non–modal group were married in larger numbers than were their modal classmates to men in the professions and the professions most heavily represented were the health related professions, while the professions of teaching, engineering and the "other" professions were more heavily represented by husbands of modal respondents.

Respondents in the non–modal group had more children and more of them were under 13 years of age at the time of reporting than was the case with modal group respondents.

The respondents in the non–modal group perceived their husbands to have less favorable attitudes toward their employment as nurses than did the respondents in the modal group.

Approximately one quarter of the respondents in each group was unable to identify a single factor that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career; another quarter in each group identified parents and close relatives as the most significant influence in their choice; the influence of persons in nursing and the other health related fields was more important for modal respondents, particularly those in the later Classes, than it was for the non–modal respondents.

The respondents in the model group perceived the attitude of people in the lower class of the general public to be more favorable toward a career in nursing than did the respondents in the non–modal group; respondents in the non–modal group perceived the attitude of the middle and upper classes to be more favorable toward a career in nursing than did respondents in the modal group; there was no change over time in the perceptions of lower class attitudes by either group of respondents, but there was a shift toward perception of more favorable attitudes on the part of the middle and upper classes by both groups of respondents over time.

Both modal and non–modal respondents ranked personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others as their most important reasons, excluding financial reasons, for being employed in nursing; career commitment, the people I meet and scholarship/traineeship commitment fell considerably below the top ranked reasons in both groups.

The ratings the modal respondents gave to work in nursing when they compared it to work in other fields was more favorable than the rating non–modal respondents gave it; however, the average rating by both groups fell between the categories of "about the same" and "more attractive" than work in other fields.

Knowing what they knew at the time they made their responses, the respondents in both groups reported that they would choose nursing again in a better than 4 to 1 ratio.

In the matters of formal education beyond the bachelor's degree, participation in professional organizations, subscription to professional journals, publications and research, all accepted criteria of professionalism, it was not surprising to find that the modal respondents, with their continuous involvement with nursing, reported higher levels of achievement and activity than did respondents in the non–modal group.

More respondents in the modal group expressed an interest in receiving a report of the findings of the longitudinal career pattern study than did their non–modal classmates. Their suggestions for improvement in the services provided to graduates by the College and the Alumnae Association centered on opportunities for graduate study while those of the non–modal respondents centered on non educational alumnae services.

Chapter 7

Suggestions for improvement of Questionnaire Two and for improvement in the functioning of the College and the Alumnae Association for the benefit of graduates are addressed in Chapter 7. It concludes with a listing of the things respondents considered significant that were not dealt with in Questionnaire Two.

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 39 Q Two: "Criticize the questionnaire and suggest improvements."

216 respondents did not respond to this question; 9 respondents stated they had no criticism or commented favorably on the questionnaire. This total of 225 (90.4% of 249 respondents) were considered to have found the questionnaire satisfactory, at least.

The nine favorable comments are presented here.

> The questionnaire seemed adequate in most areas. It was not confusing and very well written.
>
> Appears to be fairly comprehensive.
>
> All in all a very complete questionnaire.
>
> It was fun.
>
> Very complete and concise.
>
> Very thorough and concise.
>
> Thorough and fair.
>
> All questions seemed very direct and concise.
>
> I am glad there was a question regarding why one is not now working. The only reason I am inactive now is that I have two children, ages 5 years and 15 months, and I do think my place is in the home now. Without this question, one might think I did not enjoy nursing and plan some day to return to it. At such time as my family will not be inconvenienced by my working, I will definitely return to nursing.

CRITICISM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The criticisms of the questionnaire are presented here.

Directions and/or questions were not clear, repetitious, too time consuming.

Not clear on all questions.

Directions were sometimes confusing as to what questions to skip.

Question 23 was a mind boggler.

Questionnaire format is confusing. Maybe an indented format would be better for questions in 2 directions like #22 and #26.

Question 27 might be made a little more clear if choices were numbered or lettered.

Some of the questions could be combined.

It would take too long to list the answers to questions on page 7. (Questions 31–35). I did not take the time.

Timing of the questionnaire.

If this questionnaire is to be used again (5 years hence) please send it nearer the end of the year.

It was difficult to keep in mind that information wanted was from after 1972 in this one.

It was difficult to remember a five year period. Significant information might be left out.

Inadequacies of the questionnaire.

You state (in cover letter) that this questionnaire is being used to "poll graduates about their activities since leaving the college of nursing." You must mean their nursing activities, since nothing else is included.

I wish the questionnaire did not make me feel so guilty for choosing to remain out of nursing while my children are small. When they are older and in school, I do plan to either work or go back to school.

Regarding question 19, reasons for not being employed in nursing at time of answwering Questionnaire One, Graduate study should be one of the options as this is not employment in nursing but it certainly takes time and involvement.

The primary concern that comes to mind is that, for example, questions 28 and 29, would tend to indicate that one felt conditions or situations were felt to exist which could be changed to alter one's own feelings regarding the profession. Another side enters here – that of better self–awareness, of one's own personality and emotional suitability for satisfaction in another type of work or profession. But since I am not considering returning to work until after the children are reared – or accident or death of husband necessitates it – it is extremelydifficult to know whether I would return to some area of nursing. Also, all nursing service opportunities are in a city 30 miles away – and, I understand, are not terribly lucrative. Dangers of being on the streets during most shift changes also are another deterring factor.

The questionnaire did not direct any questions as to how those who are presently employed evaluate the work they are doing.

It does not ask reasons for job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

The questionnaire seems to be slanted toward those who have advanced their education, without asking those who have not, the reasons for that.

Questions 28, 29, and 30 should have had a line available for explanation since the reasons for selections would be more helpful than the vague answers alone.

Errors in questionnaire/mailings.

I do not understand why the school has me listed as graduating in 1960and 1965. I graduated in May, 196-. My current address is. . .

Many respondents corrected a spelling error in Question 5 and noted omissions and repetitions in Question 23.

Question judged inappropriate.

Question 27 has no place in a professional survey. People in this country are no longer neatly divided into three classes.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Suggestions for improvement of questionnaire are listed here.

I think it would be interesting to see what kind of people we are, as nursing graduates who have become a vital part of many communities. We are a socially aware profession.

I think it would be interesting to know why some areas of specialization are attractive to an individual.

You might inquire about services rendered to the community related to nursing. Free time given in some capacity such as Cancer Clinic (not as a nurse but still involved in a health field.)

It might be helpful to ask a question concerning reasons people remain inactive.

Further investigation into reasons for dissatisfaction with nursing as a career needs to be pursued.

OTHER RESPONSES

Other responses.

I hope I have been helpful to the study in some way. I just pretty much stay home and care for my family.

It looks just like some of the tests I took while at UTCN.

I will be interested in seeing the results of the questionnaires. What is the focus of your survey? progress in nursing career? influence of personal life?

Share the purposes and results with us. Ask us now in retrospect, for an evaluation of our curriculum and learning experiences at U.T.C.N.

Give me feedback on any questionnaire that I fill out. It would specifically interest me to know how many are still in nursing.

Seven additional respondents made this request and comment:

Please send me a copy of the findings or the report when completed. I would be interested in seeing the results.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING SERVICES TO GRADUATES FROM COLLEGE AND ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION

Question 40 Q Two: "Indicate ways in which the College of Nursing and the Alumnae Association could be more useful to you."

The 51 responses that were recorded are listed here. Unless otherwise indicated, each response represents one respondent. One respondent made two responses.

Continuing and graduate education.

Give graduates a chance to have a voice in the types of programs on the master's level.

Make graduate study available on a part time basis.

Expand graduate education on master's level.

I would like to have detailed information about the new UT program to prepare nurse educators and to grant a master's degree.

I hope the curriculum includes courses that would help a new graduate be better prepared to be a school nurse if she so desired.

Provide a progressive master's degree program to allow teachers to get master's degrees in a minimum of time; consider an external degree program.

Provide a progressive B.S. degree program for RNs (graduates of AD and Diploma programs) to get B.S.N. in a minimum of time.

Keep alumnae more informed about things like graduate school.

Let's get a masters level program started, (I think there is one at Yale) for pediatric nurse practitioners.

Offer part time courses – night courses, etc. which lead to masters in nursing, especially in psychiatric nursing.

Offer courses for a master's degree where a person would not have to go full–time which is impossible with 4 children. If you have courses, please send brochures.

Make available a list of schools throughout the country with Master's Programs – state the area of nursing, e.g., med–surg nursing, psychiatric, cardiovascular, pediatric nursing, etc.

I would like any information you could send me about the graduate program. I'm interested in learning more about it. Is the GRE required to enroll?

A continuing refresher course by mail on the latest trends and changes in nursing would be most helpful, or perhaps even information on a subscription basis. I feel completely inadequate as a nurse, professionally.

Information on refresher courses.

I am interested in information about short term seminars, institutes and/or continuing education courses. I would like to be prepared for future employment, when and if an attractive opportunity is available.

Conduct adult education courses similar to UT Extension Service. Give college credits at night or on Saturday for courses in specific nursing areas or nursing related areas.

Begin to bring continuing education programs on nursing to areas such as UT at Martin.

Let me know when they are having short courses which would be available to me as I feel continuing education is very important. Especially, I would like to see something offered in East Tennessee – regional programs would be great. (2 respondents)

Send me some information on your general curriculum – what approaches you are using in teaching skills and theory.

Continuing education.

Advice and assistance to staff members (hospital staff nurses) regarding further education.

Keep alumnae more informed about things like short term courses.

I have ofter wondered if there are correspondence courses available for us mommies who are unable to work, or go to clinics for refresher courses, in general or specialty nursing. Having a B.S. I would like to expand my credits in maternal child nursing and take a general refresher course, but I cannot travel to a city for any length of time. If correspondence courses are available for the B.S. graduate, the college could make such information available periodically.

Please tell me the best way to refresh my mind and learn new techniques, machinery, equipment, etc. when I decide to return to nursing full time.

Changes in current curriculum

Teach students that hospitals contain patients who require professional nursing care twenty–four hours a day, seven days a week, that this care cannot be "someone else's" responsiblility eternally.

AlumnaeNewsletter and activities

Since I live so far away (1,000 miles) I feel very much "removed" from all that's going on. I have suggested previously that I would appreciate having one of the current caps from our school. I don't even know what style they are. I don't know what the cost would be but perhaps the Alumnae would be happy to buy a little bit of tangible symbol of our school of nursing.

Get my name and address correct. (2 respondents)

Could a list of nursing alumnae in an individual's area be obtained?

I have missed the last two Alumnae Days because of the date. A Saturday in June or April is preferrable.

Have Alumnae Day on another day than Saturday.

Schedule Alumnae Day after school (public school) is out.

Hold Alumnae Day in June – middle. I am unable to attend in May.

Help me keep better in touch. Arrange some summer Alumnae meetings to make attendance more feasible for those of us with school children to consider and out of state travel problems. It is absolutely impossible for my family to plan a trip in May and financially impossible for me to fly to Memphis and back for just one day!

Keep in touch.

Since many women will continue to assume the role of fulltime wife and mother, it seems that more interest might be shown in how well a nurse feels she is prepared for these roles and perhaps how she might carry out these dual responsibilities effectively. This is not a criticism – I just know that many women like myself feel frustrated at not being able to do both jobs at one time, (I mean home making and nursing full–time).

Review and recommend new textbooks as they become available.

I believe, when they know your address, they should include, with any communication to you, a list of schools in your area at which you can work toward a higher degree in nursing. I believe this would encourage advanced education.

The Newsletters, etc., have been most informative.

I think you'll (y'all?) do a great job. I hope to come to an annual meeting soon. I have been too busy "playing mama" in the past. I have three children aged 5½, 3½, 1½.

No complaints. Still appreciate and have pride in UTCN – proud to be an alumnus.

I find the correspondence very adequate.

From the few things I have received, it sounds as if there have been quite a few changes in the program. I would appreciate a "Newsletter" biannually regarding the U.T.C.N.

I did not realize the Alumnae Association had any specific connection to this questionnaire.

I have not been receiving the Newsletter from the Medical Units or the Nursing Alumnae Day Letters. I was very surprised to return to Memphis for the first time in a few years and see a parking lot at the old nursing building.

I receive NO alumnae news and would like to very much. I do not even receive Centergrams from U.T. not even at my parents address.

I have not received a Centergram or other information for several years. I have been asked questions about UTCN by student nurses but have not always been able to adequately answer then due to lack of information.

You should publish a list of each class of graduates' current or most recent addresses and send it to each graduate.

Keep me more in touch with former friends and classmates by a newsy newsletter. Let us know what is happening at the College.

Newsletters which include growth of school and/or College and new program developments would be appreciated.

SIGNIFICANT THINGS OMITTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 38 Q Two: "Please report anything that is significant to you that the questionnaire has not included."

The 45 responses that were recorded are listed here. Unless otherwise indicated, each response represents one respondent. Some respondents made more than one response.

Things That There was no Chance to Report

Employment lasting less than one year

I was, for half a year, a clinical instructor part–time in an ADN program.

Courses taken – non–credit

After an absence of eleven years (while caring for young children, I took an excellent refresher course and have since been employed at first part–time and now full–time.

I have taken short courses in coronary care and post op cardiac surgical nursing in the area where I have been working 4 of the past 5 years.

Workshops given

I participated as a group discussion leader at a workshop of the Boston Society for Gerontologic Psychiatry, Inc.

Participation in projects

I was involved, for 2 quarters, in a federally funded curriculum revision project at a Community College.

Awards received

Selected as an Outstanding Educator of America in 1975 in recognition of higher education and service to the community.

Included in Tennessee Lives, 1971.

Kappa Delta Pi Honorary Educational Society.

Sigma Theta Tau (Beta Theta) (three respondents)

Sigma Theta Tau (Alpha Theta)

Accomplishments not related directly to nursing

I have developed speaking ability in Spanish.

Plans to continue education in non–nursing

I have applied to the graduate school in Psychology at M.S.U.

The value of having been educated in nursing aside from its use as a means of being employed

I am a plain, simple sort of person, not ambitous educationally or socially. I thank the Lord for my nursing education; I'm very aware I did not pay attention half the time. Often, I think I would like to go through training again. I am thankful for my training that I can perform a service that is necessary.

Even though I have not been actively employed, I have continued to appreciate my nursing background. I occasionally help in "mass immunization clinics", as the "neighborhood consultant" and, on several occasions, I have worked as my husband's office nurse.

Although it might be considered, since I have no intention of ever working professionally again, that my education in nursing has been wasted, I do not feel that this is true. Besides contributing to my marital stability, (my husband is a pediatrician), and directly contributing to my abilities as a mother, in this country where public education in health matters is practically non–existent, I feel that my knowledge and advice based on my nursing education, has directly influenced (and will continue to influence) a rather wide circle of friends and acquaintances. I believe that I have actually done more real education in maternal and child–family health in this unofficial, non–paying position, than I could ever do as a conventional registered nurse.

The ways graduates who do not work in nursing, serve as volunteers

Red Cross Nursing has fulfilled many of my needs to stay in some volunteer area of nursing. I teach mother and baby care classes and give injections to patients confined at home under a doctor's direction.

I am not gainfully employed as a nurse, but I do work as a nurse, ocassionally in my husband's office. I am also active in nursing with the Girl Scouts. I have been the nurse at Day Camps and on camping trips.

I feel my nursing background has been most helpful to me in serving as a volunteer in various community organizations with which I now work – particularly the American Cancer Society and the County Medical Auxiliary.

I feel nursing has prepared me to deal with brain damaged psychiatric patients to a degree that I am loving volunteer work on such a ward at the local VA hospital. I am one of four who work on this all male ward. We are able to give much more individual care to the men that the nurses can.

The fact that graduates continue to be interested in nursing though not actively engaged in it

After nursing one child through a terminal illness, I believe I could return to some types of nursing situations with little difficulty.

After 4 years of being a "housewife", I have decided that nursing is more fun and I will probably return to work in the near future. I ranked my reasons for the change I made from active to inactive status – Question 20, in the order of their importance to me at the time I quit working. The reason I ranked in 3rd place then would be in 1st place now, namely, "Hourly schedule required in nursing practice was a determining factor.

Although I am very anxious to get back into my nursing career, family obligations keep me from returning at present. However, more and more, I feel my life needs to be more productive and nursing will fill this need for me. It is a wonderful profession, and to lose nursing skills and knowledge would be a sin.

The significance of part–time employment in nursing

Maybe more information should be requested in the questionnaire about part–time employment, i.e., types of positions, frequency of employment, reasons for working part time. This is important since part time employment seems to be a way for some of us to keep in touch with nursing.

Attractive aspects of returning to employment

Return to employment after taking a refresher course – I find it to be one of the most fulfilling and rewarding experiences of my life. Someday I plan to go into teaching but for the present I am enjoying doing "floor duty". My children are teenagers and still require supervision and care so I am not yet involved in (added professional) organizations. That will come later.

My present position as Inservice Education Coordinator in a General Hospital offers contact with nursing approximately 50% of the time, but also allows me to understand and work directly with administration to provide education to all departments in the hospital.

Rapidity with which graduates become outdated if they are inactive

The longer I stay out of nursing the greater the change in nursing practices. Even in four years, so much has changed, it would take a year of study to catch up. I could never walk in to care for a patient, feeling that my professional knowledge and skills were inadequate to give the type of care the patient has the right to expect and to receive.

Attitudes toward the relationship of children in the family and employment in nursing

There could be a question included such as "Do you have plans for returning to nursing when your children are school age?" Answer: Yes for me.

Speaking of children in the family and the working or non– working mother: I miss nursing, or I should say, I miss the O.R. but the baby and her growth and development come first. There are important questions to be answered concerning children, particularly young children in the family. The answers can drastically change ones attitudes towards working full–time or part–time. I enjoy working when the hospital needs me in special areas, but it has taken my husband some time to realize this. I guess I should be thankful that our, or rather his income is sufficient so we do not miss my $15,060+ income too much.

Changes in attitudes of the graduate

It might be interesting to study changes in attitudes of the nurse herself as she grows older, e.g., why she stays in nursing or leaves to pursue other interests, also what she is satisfied or dissatisfied with in nursing.

Attractive aspects of nursing in general, currently, compared with the past

Nursing is more attractive now than when I entered it because of the upgrading of the profession, wider acceptance of and esteem for the nurse on the part of the public and present economic and social factors making the health fields more attractive.

Satisfaction with preparation received at UTCN

I cherish all the memories of UT. The school has made great strides forward and I am indeed proud to be an alumnus.

I was well prepared for my nursing profession by the faculty and curriculum at UTCN. I am proud of my association with UTCN.

Reasons or Explanations There was no Chance to Describe

Reasons for not being employed in nursing

Part time help is not wanted in some hospitals – particularly if you need to work a day shift because of family obligations. As a doctor, my husbands hours don't allow for both parents to be away from home at night.

It is my opinioh that nursing could attract many inactive nurses to part time work if hospitals offered hours more compatible with school schedules, e.g., 9 a.m. to 2 p.m., Monday through Friday. I want to be at home with my family at least until my youhgest child is in school. School here is dismissed at 2:30 p.m.. Household help and child care are not easily available here.

Why am I not presently employed? Unless you wish to work full time, there is little attraction in employment. The pay is unattractive and there is continuous pressure from employers to work full time.

I have two small children and a husband who has lohg and irregular working hours which prevent me from working in nursing at this time.

I feel more nurses with children would be working if hospital hours were more flexible and allowed for school aged children. With a work shift starting at 7 a.m. there isn't any way you can see your child off to school. Help at that time in the morning is impossible to find.

I am sure hospitals would have more nurses like me who want to work but don't need to, if they could be a bit more flexible.

Reasons that could be included as options in Question #20 are: the low status of nursing among physicians, lack of willingness among nurse administrators to accept changes in nursing, discrepancy between what is described as "ideal" in practice of nursing as a profession and what is actually practiced. I have been uhable to find part time employment suitable to my needs in relation to working hours and minimum days of employment.

Since I have not been employed in nursing, I have discovered that I have many other talents which I did not have time to pursue while I was working; thus my decreased interest in nursing. I would still pursue nursing if the health department here was the caliber of the one in Memphis. I loved it.

The job satisfaction in part time nursing, I found to be poor.

Reasons for change in husband's attitude toward wife's employment in nursing

The change from favorable to unfavorable is not a reflection on nursing as unsuitable employment. It is strictly on the basis of no financial need and the feeling of both of us that husband and family come before career. There are no "women libbers" in this household.

Reasons for not pursuing post BSN studies

My lack of participation in educational activities is due to geographic limitations. I live in a small town a hundred miles from opportunities.

I have not continued work toward a masters degree because it was not possible in the areas where I was working. Since June, 1973 we have moved to an area where study will be possible.

Reasons for relatively rapid changes in employment

> My husband has been in the Army much of the period covered by this Questionnaire. This explains the brevity of my employment at various institutions.

This list of 45 things that respondents considered significant to them but which Q Two did not include indicated that

> *two of the criticisms of Q Two that were made in responses to Question 39 namely, that it was slanted toward those respondents who were active in nursing and those who had continued their formal education in nursing were supported by these responses to Question 38;*
>
> *approximately half of all the things respondents identified as significant to them, but had had no chance to report, had to do with with their lives as persons but not full–time employed nurses. In the opinion of the writers, the responses that support this view were those classified under these headings:*

Accomplishments not related directly to nursing

Plans to continue education in non–nursing

The value of having been educated in nursing, aside from its use as a means of being employed

The ways in which graduates who do not work in nursing serve as volunteers

The fact that graduates continue to be interested in nursing though not actively engaged in it

The significance of part–time employment in nursing

Attractive aspects of returning to employment

Rapidity with which graduates become outdated if they are inactive

Attitudes toward the relationship of children in the family and employment in nursing

Reasons for not being employed in nursing

Reasons for not pursuing post B.S.N. studies

APPENDIX

Table A 1. Percent of Responses for 7 Categories of Occupations of Fathers of Respondents, by Class.

	Resp-onses	Occupations of Fathers													
		Professions		Proprietor, Business Official		Salesman, Clerical Worker, Technician		Skilled Operator, Service Worker		Farm Owner		Farm Worker, Laborer		Retired, Deceased, "Other"	
Class	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	23	2	8.7	10	43.4	2	8.6	3	13.0	6	26.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1955	20	3	15.0	6	30.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	2	10.0
1956	32	4	12.5	8	25.0	4	12.6	4	12.6	11	34.4	0	0.0	1	3.1
1957	27	1	3.7	6	22.2	3	11.1	7	25.9	4	14.8	2	7.4	4	14.8
1958	35	5	14.3	13	37.2	3	8.7	2	5.8	6	17.1	4	11.4	2	5.7
1959	19	4	21.0	4	21.0	4	21.1	2	10.5	4	21.0	1	5.3	0	0.0
1960	20	2	10.0	7	35.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	0	0.0
1961	19	3	15.8	4	21.1	6	31.6	3	15.8	1	5.3	0	0.0	2	10.6
1962	22	2	9.1	9	40.9	2	9.1	5	22.7	1	4.5	1	4.5	2	9.1
1963	6	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	20	4	20.0	8	40.0	1	5.0	2	10.0	3	15.0	2	0.0	0	0.0
1965	20	7	35.0	10	50.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.0
1966	28	6	21.4	13	46.5	5	17.9	2	7.1	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	3.6
1967	11	3	27.3	4	36.4	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0.0
1968	37	6	16.2	14	37.8	11	29.1	3	8.1	3	8.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1969	30	5	16.7	12	40.0	7	23.3	4	13.3	1	3.3	1	3.3	0	0.0
1970	37	9	24.3	9	24.3	8	20.8	9	24.3	1	2.7	1	2.7	0	0.0
1971	31	4	12.9	9	29.2	7	22.6	6	19.3	3	9.7	1	3.7	1	3.2
1972	22	6	27.3	3	13.6	6	27.2	2	9.0	3	13.6	1	4.5	1	4.5
1973	23	7	30.4	6	26.1	3	13.0	3	13.0	1	4.3	2	8.7	1	4.3
1974	40	6	15.0	15	37.5	5	12.7	5	12.5	2	5.0	1	2.5	6	15.0
Total	522	92	AV 17.6	171	AV 32.8	87	AV 16.7	71	AV 13.6	56	AV 10.7	20	AV 3.8	25	AV 4.8

Table A 2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupations of Mothers of Respondents by Class

		Occupations of Mothers							
	Resp-onses	Professions		Proprietor, Business Official		Saleswoman, Clerical Worker, Technician		Skilled Operator, Service Worker	
Class		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	11	4	36.4	1	9.1	3	27.3	3	27.3
1955	7	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	42.9	2	28.6
1956	15	5	33.3	2	13.3	5	33.3	3	20.0
1957	11	3	27.3	1	9.1	3	27.3	4	36.4
1958	11	6	54.5	0	0.0	4	36.7	1	9.1
1959	10	3	30.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
1960	6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
1961	8	4	50.0	1	12.5	2	25.0	1	12.5
1962	10	4	40.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	0	0.0
1963	7	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	42.9	2	28.6
1964	9	3	33.3	1	11.1	4	44.4	1	11.1
1965	6	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	0	0.0
1966	10	5	50.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	0	0.0
1967	8	3	37.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	1	12.5
1968	22	10	45.5	3	13.6	9	40.9	0	0.0
1969	16	5	31.3	1	6.3	10	62.5	0	0.0
1970	18	6	33.3	3	16.7	7	38.9	2	11.1
1971	15	2	13.3	1	6.7	3	53.3	4	26.7
1972	12	1	8.3	1	8.3	8	66.7	2	16.7
1973	12	2	16.7	2	16.7	6	50.0	2	16.7
1974	24	5	20.8	0	0.0	12	50.0	7	29.2
Total	248	78	AV 31.5	26	AV 10.5	103	AV 41.5	41	AV 16.5

Table A 3. Average Points for 7 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers and by Mothers of Respondents, by Class and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

		Education Completed FATHER								
		Grade School	Some High School	High School Graduate	Tech/Voc. Graduate RN	Some College	College Graduate	Post Graduate		
		POINTS								
Class	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	AV
1954	23	3	20	6	4	30	0	7	70	3.04
1955	19	3	16	0	0	10	24	14	67	3.52
1956	33	8	16	9	4	50	0	21	108	3.27
1957	26	7	10	24	8	10	12	0	71	2.84
1958	34	6	22	12	8	30	18	14	110	3.23
1959	20	5	6	9	0	30	18	0	68	3.40
1960	20	4	6	12	4	15	24	7	72	3.60
1961	20	4	4	24	0	10	18	7	67	3.35
1962	22	1	8	30	8	5	12	14	78	3.54
1963	7	2	0	3	0	5	12	7	29	4.14
1964	20	1	4	21	0	25	12	21	84	4.20
1965	20	1	0	12	12	20	30	21	96	4.80
1966	28	1	14	15	4	35	30	14	113	4.03
1967	12	0	8	3	0	5	18	21	55	4.58
1968	36	3	6	30	4	30	42	42	157	4.36
1969	32	4	8	30	8	30	12	28	120	3.75
1970	36	2	14	36	8	20	30	28	138	3.83
1971	29	3	6	15	4	45	24	28	125	4.31
1972	22	3	8	10	4	15	24	35	99	4.50
1973	24	2	6	18	4	20	24	28	102	4.25
1974	40	2	12	45	8	30	30	28	155	3.87
Total	523	65	194	364	92	470	414	385	1984	3.79
Classes										
1954 - 64	244	44	112	150	36	220	150	112	824	3.37
1965 - 74	279	21	82	214	56	250	264	273	1160	4.15

Table A 3. Average Points for 7 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers and by Mothers of Respondents, by Class and by 2 Decade Groupings (Continued) of Classes.

		Education Completed MOTHER								
		Grade School	Some High School	High School Graduate	Tech/Voc. Graduate RN	Some College	College Graduate	Post Graduate		
		POINTS								
Class	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	AV
1954	23	2	10	18	8	25	18	0	81	3.52
1955	19	1	10	21	8	5	12	7	64	3.36
1956	33	3	12	36	24	10	24	0	109	3.30
1957	27	3	18	12	8	35	6	7	89	3.29
1958	34	4	10	33	8	50	12	0	117	3.44
1959	20	2	8	18	4	25	6	7	70	3.50
1960	20	1	6	21	12	20	12	0	72	3.60
1961	20	4	6	12	4	25	12	7	70	3.50
1962	22	0	10	24	8	20	12	7	81	3.68
1963	7	1	2	9	4	5	0	0	21	3.00
1964	20	2	4	12	12	25	24	0	79	3.95
1965	20	2	2	24	4	10	30	7	79	3.95
1966	28	2	2	21	24	35	6	28	118	4.21
1967	12	0	6	6	12	15	0	7	46	3.83
1968	37	1	2	36	28	40	42	7	156	4.21
1969	32	2	6	30	32	35	12	0	117	3.65
1970	37	3	12	24	28	45	12	14	138	3.72
1971	30	4	4	27	12	30	12	28	117	3.90
1972	22	2	4	9	16	30	30	0	91	4.13
1973	24	2	12	18	20	15	12	0	79	3.29
1974	41	1	10	33	28	55	18	21	165	4.04
Total	528	42	156	444	304	555	312	147	1960	3.71
Classes										
1954 - 64	245	23	96	216	100	245	138	35	853	3.48
1965 - 74	283	19	60	228	204	310	174	112	1107	3.91

Table A 4 Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Generic Program Respondents, by Class

	Sources of Financial Assistance								
	Generic Program Respondents	Available through UTCN		Available through Other Sources		Part–Time Employment		No Financial Aid Rec'd.	
Class	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	20	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	17	85.0
1955	16	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	13	81.3
1956	32	1	3.1	1	3.1	5	15.6	25	78.1
1957	21	0	0.0	2	9.5	2	9.5	17	80.9
1958	27	0	0.0	1	3.7	6	22.2	20	74.1
1959	17	0	0.0	3	17.6	1	5.9	13	76.5
1960	18	3	16.7	4	22.2	2	11.1	9	50.0
1961	16	0	0.0	6	37.5	3	18.6	7	43.8
1962	20	1	5.0	7	35.0	6	30.0	6	30.0
1963	6	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	4	66.7
1964	13	1	7.7	2	15.4	2	15.4	8	61.5
1965	16	1	6.3	5	31.3	2	12.5	8	50.1
1966	22	8	36.4	1	4.5	3	13.6	10	45.5
1967	11	7	63.6	2	18.2	1	9.1	1	9.1
1968	32	6	18.8	8	25.0	2	6.3	16	50.0
1969	26	11	42.3	4	15.4	2	7.7	9	34.6
1970	35	17	48.6	5	14.3	2	5.7	11	31.4
1971	19	5	26.3	3	15.8	1	5.3	10	52.6
1972	17	6	35.3	2	11.8	4	23.5	5	29.4
1973	19	4	21.1	0	0.0	2	10.5	13	68.4
1974	29	3	10.3	5	17.2	7	24.1	14	48.3
Total	432	77	AV 17.8	63	AV 14.6	56	AV 13.0	236	AV 54.6

Table A 5. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage Related to First Enrollment by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class

Generic Program

Class	Respondents N	Before Enrollment in UTCN %	Before Senior Year %	During Senior Year %	Within One Year After Graduation %	One to Three Years After Graduation %	More Than Three Years After Graduation
1951	18	0.0	11.1	16.7	38.9	11.1	22.2
1955	16	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	18.8	18.8
1956	31	0.0	16.1	12.9	35.5	19.4	16.1
1957	20	0.0	10.0	30.0	15.0	35.0	10.0
1958	25	0.0	28.0	12.0	20.0	24.0	16.0
1959	14	0.0	14.3	7.1	57.1	14.3	7.1
1960	17	0.0	29.4	23.5	17.6	11.7	17.6
1961	16	0.0	6.3	37.5	25.0	0.0	31.3
1962	14	0.0	28.6	14.3	42.9	7.1	7.1
1963	3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0
1964	12	8.3	25.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	0.0
1965	11	9.1	27.3	9.1	45.5	9.1	x.x
1966	14	7.1	35.7	7.1	42.9	7.1	x.x
1967	9	0.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	x.x
1968	27	0.0	11.1	3.7	59.3	25.9	x.x
1969	26	0.0	11.5	15.4	53.8	19.2	x.x
1970	24	4.2	25.0	16.7	29.1	25.0	x.x
1971	17	0.0	41.2	0.0	29.4	29.4	x.x
1972	17	11.8	47.1	5.9	23.5	11.8	x.x
1973	15	20.0	6.7	6.7	40.0	26.7	x.x
1974	21	9.5	4.8	9.5	61.9	14.3	x.x
Total	367	AV 3.0	19.3	14.7	36.5	18.8	7.6

x.x This option was not applicable for respondents in Classes 1965–1974 answering two years after graduation.

Table A 5. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage Related to First Enrollment by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class (continued)

Registered Nurse Program

Class	Respondents N	Before Enrollment in UTCN %	Before Senior Year %	During Senior Year %	Within One Year After Graduation %	One to Three Years After Graduation %	More Than Three Years After Graduation %
1954	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
1955	3	0.0	33.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
1956	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1957	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
1958	6	66.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0
1959	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
1960	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
1961	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1962	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1963	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1964	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1965	4	25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	x.x
1966	4	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1967	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1968	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	x.x
1969	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.7	x.x
1970	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1971	5	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	x.x
1972	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	x.x
1973	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1974	4	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	x.x
Total	52	AV 42.3	7.7	5.8	25.0	15.4	3.8

x.x. This option was not applicable for respondents in Classes 1965–1974 answering two years after graduation.

Table A 6. Percent of Aggregate Score in Points Derived from Responses for 6 Reasons for Employment, by Class and Respondents' UTCN Program

Reasons for Employment Excluding Financial Reasons

Class	G–R Interval	Year of Response	Personal Fulfillment		Job Satisfaction		Service to others		Career Commitment		People I Meet		Scholarship or Traineeship Commitment	
			Gen Prog %	RN Prog %	Gen Prog %	RN Prog %	Gen Prog %	RN Prog %	Gen Prog %	RN Prog %	Gen Prog %	RN Prog %	Gen Prog %	RN Prog %
1954	13	1967	32	00	24	00	16	00	14	00	09	00	03	00
1955	12	1967	25	29	19	17	21	14	13	22	16	14	04	02
1956	11	1967	26	33	20	26	22	40	12	00	15	00	02	00
1957	10	1967	24	30	24	21	23	25	13	12	10	08	03	01
1958	9	1967	24	28	24	16	20	22	16	14	10	13	03	04
1959	8	1967	23	28	26	23	20	14	16	14	10	14	04	04
1960	7	1967	24	23	25	28	24	09	06	19	14	14	03	04
1961	6	1967	22	28	19	18	28	02	11	28	16	10	02	10
1962	5	1967	27	19	23	14	18	04	13	23	13	09	03	28
1963	4	1967	22	28	37	23	18	19	07	14	11	04	03	09
1964	3	1967	22	21	17	24	21	23	15	10	16	14	06	04
1965	2	1967	23	26	21	21	20	28	15	12	15	07	05	05
1966	2	1968	24	23	20	21	18	18	17	12	14	07	04	17
1967	2	1969	24	00	20	00	20	00	14	00	13	00	07	00
1968	2	1970	24	25	19	22	22	24	12	12	15	11	05	03
1969	2	1971	27	24	17	17	22	24	12	09	13	13	07	09
1970	2	1972	24	28	20	14	21	19	14	23	13	09	04	04
1971	2	1973	25	23	21	21	18	18	16	20	13	11	05	05
1972	2	1974	24	23	22	15	18	17	16	22	13	11	04	09
1973	2	1975	24	28	23	19	20	19	14	17	13	12	05	03
1974	2	1976	27	18	19	22	19	17	17	22	12	08	04	09
Mean of percents			25.1	25.5	22.3	20.2	20.8	18.7	14.5	16.9	14.6	10.5	04.6	07.2

Table A 7. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class.

		Generic Program							Registered Nurse Program						
	Grad–Resp. Int	Resp-ond ents	Current Membership		Previous Membership		Never a Member		Resp-ond ents	Current Member		Previous Member		Never a Member	
Class	Years	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	13	20	4	20.0	13	65.0	3	15.0	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
1955	12	17	5	29.4	12	70.6	0	0.0	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
1956	11	32	8	25.0	16	50.0	8	25.0	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1957	10	23	3	13.0	15	65.2	5	21.7	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
1958	9	27	8	29.6	9	33.3	10	37.0	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0.0
1959	8	17	8	47.1	7	41.2	2	11.8	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
1960	7	18	1	5.6	13	72.2	4	22.2	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
1961	6	17	3	17.6	7	41.2	7	41.2	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1962	5	21	6	28.6	8	38.1	7	33.3	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1963	4	6	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	3	15	5	33.3	6	40.0	4	26.7	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
1965	2	16	8	50.0	2	12.5	6	37.5	4	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
1966	2	22	7	31.8	7	31.8	8	36.4	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0
1967	2	12	7	58.3	1	8.3	4	33.3	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	2	34	16	47.1	9	26.5	9	26.5	3	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3
1969	2	26	7	26.9	8	30.8	11	42.3	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
1970	2	36	17	47.2	6	16.7	13	36.1	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1971	2	24	14	58.3	3	12.5	7	29.2	8	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0
1972	2	19	6	31.6	6	31.6	7	36.8	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0
1973	2	21	8	38.1	1	4.8	12	57.1	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1974	2	33	12	36.4	1	3.0	20	60.6	8	7	87.5	0	0.0	1	12.5
Total		456	154	AV 33.8	154	AV 33.8	148	AV 32.5	76	49	AV 64.4	20	AV 26.3	7	AV 9.2
Averages 3-13 yrs.		N=213		AV 24.4		51.6		23.9	N=35		AV 60.0		37.1		2.9
Averages 2 yrs.		N=243		AV 42.0		18.1		39.9	N=41		AV 68.3		17.1		14.6

Table A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class.

Local Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Yrs.	N	N	Pts.	N	Pts.	N	Pts.	Total Pts.
1954	13	16	2	6	2	4	12	12	22
1955	12	15	2	6	3	6	10	10	22
1956	11	22	3	9	7	14	12	12	35
1957	10	17	3	9	3	6	11	11	26
1958	9	17	8	24	0	0	9	9	33
1959	8	13	0	0	1	2	12	12	14
1960	7	13	0	0	4	8	9	9	17
1961	6	10	0	0	4	8	6	6	14
1962	5	14	1	3	7	14	6	6	23
1963	4	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	5
1964	3	10	1	3	3	6	6	6	15
1965	2	10	1	3	2	4	7	7	14
1966	2	14	1	3	1	2	12	12	17
1967	2	8	1	3	3	6	4	4	13
1968	2	25	1	3	6	12	18	18	33
1969	2	14	0	0	1	2	13	13	15
1970	2	20	0	0	4	8	16	16	24
1971	2	18	0	0	1	2	17	17	19
1972	2	11	0	0	2	4	9	9	13
1973	2	9	1	3	2	4	6	6	13
1974	2	12	0	0	2	4	10	10	14
Total		293	25	75	59	118	209	209	402
				18.7% of 402		29.4% of 402		52.0% of 402	39.0% of 1032

Table A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class. (Continued)

State Association

Class	G–R Int Yrs.	Resp-ondents N	Leader Responses N	Pts.	Active Responses N	Pts.	Minimal Responses N	Pts.	Total Pts.
1954	13	16	2	6	2	4	12	12	22
1955	12	15	0	0	3	6	12	12	18
1956	11	22	0	0	0	0	22	22	22
1957	10	17	1	3	2	4	14	14	21
1958	9	17	1	3	7	14	9	9	26
1959	8	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13
1960	7	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13
1961	6	10	1	3	1	2	8	8	13
1962	5	14	0	0	2	4	12	12	16
1963	4	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5
1964	3	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1965	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1966	2	14	0	0	1	2	13	13	15
1967	2	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10
1968	2	25	0	0	0	0	25	25	25
1969	2	14	0	0	1	2	13	13	15
1970	2	20	1	3	1	2	18	18	23
1971	2	18	1	3	0	0	17	17	20
1972	2	11	0	0	1	2	10	10	12
1973	2	9	0	0	0	0	9	9	9
1974	2	12	0	0	2	4	10	10	14
Total		293	7	21	25	50	261	261	332
				6.3% of 332		15.1% of 332		78.6% of 332	32.2% of 1032

Table A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class. (Continued)

National Association

Class	G–R Int Yrs.	Resp-ondents N	Leader Responses N		Active Responses N	Pts.	Minimal Responses N	Pts.	Pts.	Grand Total
1954	13	16	1	3	0	0	15	15	18	62
1955	12	15	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	55
1956	11	22	0	0	0	0	22	22	22	79
1957	10	17	0	0	1	2	16	16	18	65
1958	9	17	0	0	1	2	16	16	18	77
1959	8	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13	40
1960	7	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13	43
1961	6	10	0	0	1	2	9	9	11	38
1962	5	14	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	53
1963	4	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	16
1964	3	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	35
1965	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	34
1966	2	14	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	46
1967	2	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	31
1968	2	25	0	0	0	0	25	25	25	83
1969	2	14	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	44
1970	2	20	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	67
1971	2	18	0	0	0	0	18	18	18	57
1972	2	11	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	36
1973	2	9	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	31
1974	2	12	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	40
Total		293	1	3	3	6	289	289	298	1032
				1.0% of 298		2.0% of 298		97.0% of 298	28.9% of 1032	

Table A 9. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Level by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class.

Local Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	3	2	6	0	0	1	1	7
1955	12	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1956	11	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1957	10	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1958	9	8	4	12	3	6	1	1	19
1959	8	3	1	3	0	0	2	2	5
1960	7	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	4
1961	6	4	4	12	0	0	0	0	12
1962	5	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1963	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1964	3	5	1	3	2	4	2	2	9
1965	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1966	2	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	8
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1969	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	7
1972	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1973	2	3	0	0	3	6	0	0	6
1974	2	8	1	3	2	4	5	5	12
Total		69	13	39 33.3% of 117	22	44 37.6% of 117	34	34 29.1% of 117	117 40.3% of 290

Table A 9. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Level by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class.
(Continued)

State Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	3	0	0	2	4	1	1	5
1955	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1956	11	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
1957	10	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1958	9	8	2	6	4	8	2	2	16
1959	8	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1960	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1961	6	4	2	6	2	4	0	0	10
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1964	3	5	1	3	1	2	3	3	8
1965	2	3	1	3	0	0	2	2	5
1966	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1969	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	8
1972	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1973	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1974	2	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10
Total		69	7	21 21.2% of 99	16	32 32.3% of 99	46	46 46.4% of 99	99 34.1% of 290

Table A 9. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Level by
(Continued) Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class.

National Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts	Grand Total Pts
1954	13	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	16
1955	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	10
1956	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6
1957	10	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	10
1958	9	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10	45
1959	8	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	12
1960	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	9
1961	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	26
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1964	3	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	6	23
1965	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	13
1966	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	20
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1969	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	14
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	21
1972	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9
1973	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	12
1974	2	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	30
Total		69	0	0 0% of 74	5	10 13.5% of 74	64	64 86.5% of 74	74 25.5% of 290	290

Table A 10. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options, by Respondents' UTCN Program by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class

			Generic Program						Registered Nurse Program						
	G–R Interval		Current Member Responses		Previous Member Responses		Never a Member Responses			Current Member Responses		Previous Member Responses		Never a Member Responses	
Class	Years	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	13	19	2	10.5	7	36.8	10	52.6	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	00.0
1955	12	17	1	5.9	4	23.5	12	70.6	3	2	66.7	0	00.0	1	33.3
1956	11	31	6	19.4	5	12.1	20	64.5	1	0	00.0	1	100.0	0	00.0
1957	10	22	2	9.1	5	22.7	15	68.2	4	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
1958	9	27	4	14.8	7	25.9	16	59.3	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	00.0
1959	8	17	2	11.8	6	35.3	9	52.9	3	0	00.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
1960	7	17	2	11.8	2	11.8	13	76.5	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	00.0
1961	6	17	3	17.6	6	35.3	8	47.1	4	4	100.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1962	5	21	3	14.3	4	19.0	14	66.7	1	1	100.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1963	4	6	0	0.0	1	16.7	5	83.3	1	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	100.0
1964	3	14	0	0.0	1	7.1	13	92.9	5	2	40.0	0	00.0	3	60.0
1965	2	16	1	6.3	1	6.3	14	87.5	4	0	00.0	0	00.0	4	100.0
1966	2	22	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	100.0	6	0	00.0	1	16.7	5	83.3
1967	2	12	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7	0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1968	2	34	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	100.0	3	0	00.0	0	00.0	3	100.0
1969	2	26	1	3.8	0	0.0	25	96.2	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
1970	2	36	0	0.0	1	2.8	35	97.2	1	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	100.0
1971	2	24	0	0.0	13	54.2	11	45.8	8	0	00.0	4	50.0	4	50.0
1972	2	19	0	0.0	1	5.3	18	94.7	3	1	33.3	0	00.0	2	66.7
1973	2	21	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	100.0	3	0	00.0	1	33.0	2	66.7
1974	2	32	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	100.0	8	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5
Total		450	28	AV 6.2	64	AV 14.2	358	AV 79.6	75	22	AV 29.3	16	AV 21.3	37	AV 49.3
Averages, 3-13 yrs.		N=208		AV 12.0		AV 23.1		AV 64.9	N=34		AV 52.9		AV 23.5		AV 23.5
Averages, 2 yrs.		N=242		AV 1.2		AV 6.6		AV 92.1	N=41		AV 9.8		AV 19.5		AV 70.7

Table A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class

Local League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	8	1	3	1	2	6	6	11
1955	12	5	1	3	1	2	3	3	8
1956	11	11	2	6	2	4	7	7	17
1957	10	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	8
1958	9	10	1	3	3	6	6	6	15
1959	8	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10
1960	7	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1961	6	9	2	6	1	2	6	6	14
1962	5	7	0	0	3	6	4	4	10
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1964	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1965	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1968	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1971	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1972	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1973	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1974	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		89	7	21	17	34	65	65	120
				17.5% of 120		28.3% of 120		54.2% of 120	37.4% of 321

Table A 11. (Continued) Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class

State League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	8	1	3	1	2	6	6	11
1955	12	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	6
1956	11	11	1	3	1	2	9	9	14
1957	10	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	7
1958	9	10	1	3	3	6	6	6	15
1959	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8
1960	7	4	1	3	0	0	3	3	6
1961	6	9	1	3	1	2	7	7	12
1962	5	7	0	0	1	2	6	6	8
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1964	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1965	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1968	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1971	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1973	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1974	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		89	5	15	9	18	75	75	108
				13.9% of 108		16.7% of 108		69.4% of 108	33.6% of 321

Table A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by
(Continued) Generic Program Respondents, by Class

National League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Pts	Grand Total Pts
1954	13	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	30
1955	12	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	19
1956	11	11	1	3	0	0	10	10	13	44
1957	10	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	7	22
1958	9	10	0	0	1	2	9	9	11	41
1959	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	26
1960	7	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	15
1961	6	9	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	35
1962	5	7	0	0	0	0	7	7	7	25
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1964	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1965	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1968	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1970	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1971	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	30
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1973	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1974	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		89	1	3	2	4	86	86	93	321
				3.2% of 93		4.3% of 93		92.5% of 93	29.0% of 321	

Table A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class

Local League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1955	12	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1956	11	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1957	10	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1958	9	8	4	12	3	6	1	1	19
1959	8	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1960	7	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	5
1961	6	4	3	9	1	2	0	0	11
1962	5	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1963	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1964	3	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1965	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1973	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1974	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
Total		37	12	36	9	18	16	16	70
				51.4% of 70		25.7% of 70		22.9% of 70	41.2% of 170

Table A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class
(Continued)

State League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1955	12	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1956	11	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
1957	10	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1958	9	8	3	9	4	8	1	1	18
1959	8	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1960	7	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1961	6	4	0	0	4	8	0	0	8
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1963	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1964	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1965	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1973	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1974	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
Total		37	6	18	11	22	20	20	60
				30.0% of 60		36.7% of 60		33.3% of 60	35.3% of 170

Table A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by
(Continued) Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class

National League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Pts	Gran Tota Pts
1954	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	10
1955	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	9
1956	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6
1957	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	9
1958	9	8	0	0	3	6	5	5	11	48
1959	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	8
1960	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	11
1961	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	23
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1963	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1964	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	8
1965	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	13
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1973	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1974	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9
Total		37	0	0	3	6	34	34	40	170
			0	0% of 40		15.0% of 40		85.0% of 40	23.5% of 170	

Table A #13. Percent of Responses for *Occupation of Father By Modal and Non–modal Respondents and by 2 Groups of Classes

		Primary Occupation of Father										
		Profession	Proprietor	Business Official	Salesman	Clerical Worker	Farm Owner and Manager	Farm Worker	Technician Semi–Professional	Skilled Operator	Service Worker	Laborer
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	13.0	11.0	21.0	8.0	7.0	15.0	1.0	3.0	16.0	3.0	2.0
Classes 1954 1964	53	7.5	13.2	15.1	9.4	5.7	20.8	1.9	1.9	18.9	1.9	3.8
1965 1969	47	19.1	8.5	27.7	6.4	8.5	8.5	0.0	4.3	12.8	4.3	0.0
Non-Modal Group	N											
Total	116	20.7	25.9	14.7	6.0	2.6	8.6	0.0	6.0	9.5	2.6	3.4
Classes 1954 1964	84	15.5	23.8	17.8	4.8	2.4	10.7	0.0	5.9	11.9	3.6	3.6
Classes 1965 1969	32	34.4	31.3	6.3	9.4	3.1	3.1	0.0	6.3	3.1	0.0	3.1

*In this comparison the responses in the options "retired" and "deceased" were tabulated according to the former occupation that was specified.

Table A 14 Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Age of Respondent and Ages of Children, Q One and Q Two

	Q One				Q Two			
	Modal	Group	Non–Modal	Group	Modal	Group	Non–Modal	Group
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Aged Under 25 never married	13	13.0	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Age 25–45 never married	17	17.0	3	2.5	21	21.0	2	1.7
Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0
No children age under 25	23	23.0	16	13.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
No children age 25–45	15	15.0	10	8.4	17	17.0	3	2.5
All children under 30 months	6	6.0	14	11.8	9	9.0	5	4.2
Oldest child under 6 youngest under 30 Mos.	4	4.0	18	15.1	9	9.0	19	16.0
Oldest child under 13 youngest under 30 Mos.	2	2.0	12	10.1	4	4.0	12	10.1
All children ages 2½–6	8	8.0	17	14.3	15	15.0	11	9.2
Oldest under 13 youngest 2½–6	7	7.0	15	12.6	2	2.0	9	7.6
All children 6–13	5	5.0	9	7.6	9	9.0	27	22.7
Oldest children under 20 youngest under 2½	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	11	9.2
Oldest child under 20 youngest 2½–6	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.0	5	4.2
Oldest child under 20 youngest 6–13	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	6.0	8	6.7
All children ages 13–20	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.0	6	5.0
Oldest child left household youngest 2½–6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
TOTAL	100	100.0	119	100.0	100	100.0	119	99.9

LONGITUDINAL CAREER PATTERN STUDY

of

GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

COLLEGE OF NURSING

1954 through 1974

VOLUME 2

Memphis, Tennessee
1980

Grace Spice Wallace, B.S.
W. Theodore May, Ph.D.

Volume 2

FORWARD

This publication is the second of a two volume report on the findings of the Longitudinal Career Pattern Study of Graduates of The University of Tennessee College of Nursing, 1954–1974.

Volume 1 includes the description of the study, the characteristics of the target population and the participants, the identification of the geographic regions from which participants came to attend The University of Tennessee College of Nursing and those aspects of the participants' activities after graduation that relate to post-baccalaureate education and employment and the participants' evaluation of their level of preparation for practice. It also includes a comparison of the activities of a modal group of respondents who were continuously active in nursing since graduation and a control group of their classmates who were less active.

Volume 2 includes findings on those aspects of the participants' activities that relate to personal history and career choices both before and after graduation and professional and community activities after graduation.

Volume 2

FORWARD ii
CONTENTS iii
LIST OF TABLES v

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Volume 2 xix

CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS 1
Occupations of Parents 1
Education of Parents 14
Sibling Birth Order and Number 25
Financial Aid for UTCN Program 29

CHAPTER 2. PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION 32
Region of Residence Since Graduation 32
Marital Status 36
Time of First Marriage 44
Fiancé's Activity at Time of Engagement 47
Age and Family Situation of Respondent 54
Husbands's Occupation 63

CHAPTER 3. CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTIONS 73
Career Choice 73
Respondent's Perceptions of Public Attitudes Toward Nursing as a Career 77
Most Important Nursing Position 87
Career Satisfactions/Dissatisfactions 90
Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing 93
Reconsideration of Career Choice 101
Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse 106
Lasting Friendships Among Respondents 110

CHAPTER 4. PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES 113
Professional Activities 113
Voluntary Health and Welfare Organization Activities 133
Voluntary Community Organization Activities 136
Nursing Journal Subscriptions 138

CHAPTER 5. HONORS AND PROFESSIONAL ACHEIVEMENTS 142
Honors and Awards 142
Professional Achievements 148
Consultations 148
Public Speaking Activities 152
Publishing Activities 160
Research Activities 162

CHAPTER 6. CONTINUOUS NURSING CAREERS 165
Background of Respondents 165
Personal History Since Graduation 179
Career Choice and Career Satisfaction 189
Professional and Community Activities 205
Honors and Professional Achievements 206
Criticism and Suggestions for Improvement of the Questionnaire 218
Summary of Findings – Chapter 6 219

CHAPTER 7. CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE 221
Criticism of Questionnaire 222
Suggestions for Improvement 223
Suggestions for Improving Services to Graduates from College and Alumnae Association 224
Significant Things Omitted from Questionnaire 228

APPENDIX 234

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

OCCUPATION OF PARENTS

Table Page

Q 3 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Father or Guardian 1

Q 3 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Father's Occupation in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 3

Q 3 #3. Summary Table. Percent of Responses for 7 Categories of Father's Occupation by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 4

Q 3 #4. Percent of Responses for Father's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program . . . 5

Q 5 #1. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents at Time of Admission to UTCN 6

Q 5 #2. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers at Time of Respondent's Admission to UTCN, by Class 7

Q 5 #3. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents by Decade Groupings of Classes 8

Q 5 #4. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 8

Q 5 #5. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in NLN, UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies 9

Q 5 #6. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program 10

Q 6 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Mother 11

Q 6 #2. Percent of Responses for 8 Occupations of Mothers by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 12

Q 6#3. Percent of Responses for Occupations of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program . 13

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

Q 7 #1. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Father of Respondent 14

Q 7 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers of Respondents in 3 Studies 14

Q 7 #3. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Mother of Respondent 15

Q 7 #4. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in 3 Studies 16

Q 7 #5. Percent of Responses for 4 Levels of Education Completed by Total Population of Fathers and Mothers of Respondents and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 17

Q 7 #6. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Fathers, by Respondents' UTCN Program 19

Q 7 #7. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program 20

Q 4 #1. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers 21

Q 4 #2. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies . . . 21
Q 4 #3. Percent of Mothers who were Registered Nurses by Class . . . 22
Q 4 #4. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Respondents' Mothers, by Two Groupings of Classes . . . 23
Q 4 #5. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program . . . 24

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER AND NUMBER

Q 8 #1. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options . . . 25
Q 8 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options by Baccalaureate Program Respondents in NLN Study . . . 25
Q 8 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options by Respondents' UTCN Program . . . 25
Q 9 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings . . . 26
Q 9 #2. Percent of Responses for Living Siblings by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes . . . 27
Q 9 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings by Respondents' UTCN Program . . . 28

FINANCIAL AID FOR UTCN PROGRAM

Q 2 #1. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid . . . 29
Q 2 #2. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid by Respondents' UTCN Program . 29
Q 2 #3. Percent of Generic Program Respondents Who Received/Did not Receive Aid by 3 Class Groupings Based on Availability of Federal Funds . . . 31

CHAPTER 2

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

REGION OF RESIDENCE SINCE GRADUATION

Q 47 #1. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation . . . 32
Q 47#2. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals . . . 33
Q 47 #3. Percent of Responses for Region of Origin, Residence after Graduation and Employment, Q One and Q Two . . . 34
Q 47 #4. Percent of Responses for U.S. Regions and Foreign Country of Residence Since Graduation by Respondents' UTCN Program . . . 35

MARITAL STATUS

Q 49 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options 36
Q 49 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 37
Q 49 #3. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Class 38
Q 49 #4. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program. 39
Q 49 #5. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status Q Two 40
Q 49 #6. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two 40
Q 49 #7. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status Q Two, by Respondents' UTCN Program 41
Q49 #8. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two, by Respondents' UTCN Program 41
Q 49 #9. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Marital Status Options 42
Q 49 #10. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Change in Marital Status Q Two 42
Q 49 #11. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two. 42
Q49#12. Percent of Responses from Selected UTCN and NLN Respondents for 3 Categories of Marital Status by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 43

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

Q 51 #1. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage 44
Q 51 #2. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage by Respondents' UTCN Program 45
Q 51 #3. Responses of Generic Program Respondents for Five Options for Time of First Marriage, Using Point System, by Class 46

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

Q 52 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement . . 47
Q 52 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement, by Respondents' UTCN Program 48
Q 52 #3. Percent of Responses for Fiancé Attendance at UT Medical Units by College/School/Program 49
Q52 #4. Percent of Responses for Four Medical Units Colleges for Fiancé Attendance, by Respondent's Class 50

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

Q 48 #1. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories 54
Q 48 #2. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories by Respondents' UTCN Program 55
Q 48 #3. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories, Q Two 57
Q 48 #4. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Age and Family Situation Categories, by Q One and Q Two 59
Q 50 #1. Percent of Responses for 7 Options for Number of Living Children 61
Q 50 #2. Percent of Responses for 7 Options of Number of Living Children by Respondents' UTCN Program 62

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

Q 55 #1. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband 63
Q 55 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband 64
Q 55 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband by Class 65
Q 55 #4. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Two Graduation–Response Intervals 67
Q 55 #5. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Professions of Husbands 68
Q 55 #6. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program . 68
Q 55 #7. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband in 4 Categories by Respondents' UTCN Program 69
Q 55 #8. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Profession of Husband, by Respondents' UTCN Program 70
Q 53 #1. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces, by Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval 71
Q 53 #2. Percent of Responses for Husband's Status with Armed Forces by Respondents' UTCN Program 72
Q 53 #3. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces by Respondents' UTCN Program, Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval 72

CHAPTER 3

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTIONS

CAREER CHOICE

Q 57 #1. Percent of Responses for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing . 73
Q 57 #2. Percent of Responses (Reorganized) for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing 75
Q 57 #3. Percent of Responses for Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program 76

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

Q 58 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing 78

Q 58 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program 79

Q 58 #3. Percent of Responses for Approving and Disapproving Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' Class 80

Q 58 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q Two 81

Q 58 #5. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two 82

Q 58 #6. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two 82

Q 58 #7. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 83

Q 58 #8. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing for Two Year–Seven Year Sample 84

Q 58 #9. Mean Ratings of Responses from Various Populations for Perceived Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing of Three Classes of General Public 85

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

Q 24 #1. Percent of Responses for Position Rated Most Important 87

Q 24 #2. Percent of Responses for Positions Held for One Year or More, Currently Held and Most Important 88

Q 24 #3. Percent of Responses for Most Important Position by Respondents' UTCN Program. 89

CAREER SATISFACTIONS/DISSATISFACTIONS

Q 30 #1. Reasons (Non-financial) for Present Employment Ranked for Importance 90

Q 30 #2. Ranking of Reasons for Present Employment by Various Point Systems 91

FEELINGS ABOUT NOT BEING EMPLOYED IN NURSING

Q 41 #1. Percent of Responses for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing 93

Q 41 #2. Percent of Responses for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents 93

Q 41 #3. Percent of Responses for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 94

Q 42 #1. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About Not Being Active in Nursing 95

Q 42 #2. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About Not being Active in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents 95

Q 42 #3. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About Not Being Active in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 96
Q 59 #1. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields . . . 97
Q 59 #2. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 97
Q 59 #3. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program 98
Q 59 #4. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q Two 98
Q 59 #5. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q One and Q Two. 99
Q 59 #6. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 99
Q 59 #7. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields for Two Year–Seven Year Sample 100

RECONSIDERATION OF CAREER CHOICE

Q 60 #1. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career 101
Q 60 #2. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 101
Q 60 #3. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program 102
Q 60 #4. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career Q Two .102
Q 60 #5. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career Q One and Q Two 103
Q 60 #6. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 103
Q 60 #7. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choice Q Two 104
Q 60 #8. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choice by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two 105

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

Q 54 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse 106
Q 54 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse by 2 Graudation–Response Intervals .106
Q 54 #3. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse by Respondents' UTCN Program 107
Q 54 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse for Respondents Married or Remarried Since Q One 108
Q 54 #5. Percent of Responses for Type of Change in Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse Since Q One 108

LASTING FRIENDSHIPS AMONG RESPONDENTS

Q 56 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are Now Friends 110
Q 56 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are Now Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program 110
Q 56 #3. Mean Number of Fellow Students Counted as Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class 111

CHAPTER 4

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Q 61 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options 113
Q 61 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' Program UTCN 113
Q 62 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation 115
Q 62 #2. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and by Respondents' UTCN Program 116
Q 62 #3. Summary Table. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 117
Q 62 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two 120
Q 63 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options 121
Q 63 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program 121
Q 64 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation 123
Q 64 #2. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and by Respondents' UTCN Program 124
Q 64 #3. Summary Table. Percent of Points for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 125
Q 64 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two 128
Q 65 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations 129
Q 65 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 129

Q 65 #3. Percent of Responses for One and Two Memberships in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 130
Q 66 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations 131
Q66 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 132

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Q 68 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations 133
Q68#2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 134

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Q 69 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations 136
Q69#2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program 136

NURSING JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Q 70 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions 138
Q 70 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program 138
Q 70 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class 139

CHAPTER 5

HONORS AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

HONORS AND AWARDS

Q 67 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships 142
Q 67 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships by Respondents' UTCN Program 142
Q 67 #3. Percent of Responses for Membership in One, Two and More Honorary Societies by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class .143
Q 71 #1. Distribution of Sigma Theta Tau Membership by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Chapter 146

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

CONSULTANTS

Q 71 #2. Consultations, Subjects and Organizations, Q One .148
Q 71 #3. Consultations, Subjects and Organizations, Q Two .150

PUBLIC SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities, Subjects and Audiences, Q One .152
Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities, Subjects and Audiences, Q Two .155

PUBLISHING ACTIVITIES

List of Publications Q One .160
List of Publications Q Two .160

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

List of Research Projects Q One .162
List of Research Projects Q Two .163

CHAPTER 6

CONTINUOUS NURSING CAREERS

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

OCCUPATION OF FATHER

MG #1. Summary Table. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Occupation of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes .166

EMPLOYED/NOT EMPLOYED STATUS OF MOTHER

MG #2. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes .168

OCCUPATION OF MOTHER

MG #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes .169

EDUCATION OF FATHER

MG #4. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes .170

EDUCATION OF MOTHER

MG #5. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 171

COMPARISON OF EDUCATION COMPLETED BY FATHER AND MOTHER

MG #6. Percent of Responses for 2 Educational Levels of Father and Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 173

NURSING EDUCATION OF MOTHER

MG #7. Percent of Responses for Level of Nursing Education Completed by Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 174

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER

MG #8. Percent of Responses for Birth Order Among Siblings for Modal and Non-modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 176

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

MG #9. Percent of Responses for Number of Siblings for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 177

FINANCIAL AID FOR UTCN PROGRAM

MG #10. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 178

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

MARITAL STATUS

MG #11. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One 179
MG #12. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q Two 180

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

MG #13. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 182

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

MG #14. Percent of Responses for Activity of Fiancé at time of Engagement for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 183

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

MG #15. Summary Table. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Age, Marital Status and Age of Children for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Q One and Q Two 184
MG #16. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Children for Modal and Non-modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 185
MG #17. Average Number of Living Children per Respondent for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 186

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

MG #18. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 187
MG #19. Percent of Responses for Husband's Profession for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 188

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTION

CAREER CHOICE

MG #20. Percent of Responses for Factor That Most Influenced Choice of Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 189

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

MG #21. Average Values for Most to Least Favorable Attitudes Toward Nursing as a Career as Perceived by Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One and Q Two 192

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

MG #22. Percent of Responses for Type of Most Important Position for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 194

CAREER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION

MG #23. Percent of Aggregate Points and Mean Rank for Responses to 6 Reasons (non financial) for Present Employment for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals 196

MG #24. Average Points for Attractiveness of Work in Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One and Q Two 198

RECONSIDERATION OF CAREER CHOICE

MG #25. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 199

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

MG #26. Percent of Responses for 5 Attitudes of Husband re Employment as a Nurse for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One 201

LASTING FRIENDSHIPS OF RESPONDENTS

MG #27. Percent of Responses for Number of Classmates Counted as Friends for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 204

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

POST BACCALAUREATE EDUCATION

MG #28. Number of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Reporting Master's Degrees by Major and by Class 205

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

MG #29. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 207
MG #30. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at 3 Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes . . .209
MG #31. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 210
MG #32. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at 3 Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes . . .211
MG #33. Percent of Responses for Membership in Other Professional Organizations by Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes 213
MG #34. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents in Other Professional Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes 214

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

MG #35. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non-modal Respondents for Number of Memberships on Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes 215

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

MG #36. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes . . .216

PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

MG #37. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Journal Subscriptions by 2 Groups of Classes 217

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS, PUBLIC ADDRESSES, PUBLICATIONS AND

RESEARCH PROJECTS

MG#38. Percent of Respondents in Modal and Non–modal Groups Reporting Professional Activities by 2 Groups of Classes, Q One and Q Two 218

CHAPTER 7

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNARIE

List of favorable Comments 221
List of Criticisms of Questionnaire 222
List of Suggestions for Improvement of the Questionnaire 223
List of Suggestions for Improving Services to Graduates from the College and the Alumnae Association 224
List of Signficant Things Omitted from the Questionnaire 228

APPENDIX

A 1. Percent of Responses for 7 Categories of Occupations of Fathers of Respondents, by Class 234
A 2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupations of Mothers of Respondents, by Class 235
A 3. Average Points for 7 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers and Mothers of Respondents, by Class and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes 236
A. 4. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Generic Program Respondents, by Class 238

A 5. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage Related to First Enrollment, by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class 239
A 6. Percent of Aggregate Score in Points Derived from Responses for 6 Reasons for Employment, by Class and Respondents' UTCN Program 241
A 7. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 242
A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class 243
A 9. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents, by Class 246
A 10. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options, by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class 249
A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class 250
A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents, by Class 253
A 13. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Father by Modal and Non–modal Respondents and by 2 Groups of Classes 256
A 14. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Age of Respondents and Ages of Children, Q One and Q Two 257

SUMMARY

Some of the major findings presented in Volume 2 are summarized below.

On the subject of family background of respondents, it was established that the occupations of approximately 70% of the fathers of respondents fell into the categories of profession, business offical, proprietor, farm owner and skilled operator and that, over time, the proportion of fathers in the first three categories increased while it decreased in the remaining two categories.

The proportion of mothers who were employed at the time the respondent enrolled at UTCN was consistently below the estimated national rate for employment among mothers but the proportion did increase, over time, to approach the national rate.

The occupations of approximately 70% of the employed mothers fell into the categories of profession, clerical worker and service worker and, over time, the proportion of mothers increased in only one or these, namely clerical worker.

On the subject of the level of education completed by parents of respondents, it was established that a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had less than high school graduation but a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had graduated from college and done post graduate work while a greater proportion of mothers than fathers were high school and vocational/technical graduates. The level of education completed by fathers and by mothers increased, over time, for both, with fathers beginning at a lower level and ending at a higher level than did mothers. There was a trend toward more respondents in later Classes having a registered nurse mother than was the case in earlier Classes.

Half the respondents reported being only children or oldest children. There was a trend toward decreasing numbers of siblings in the family of the respondent over time.

On the subject of financial aid for respondents while they were enrolled at UTCN, it was evident that as financial assistance became available through the Professional Nurse Traineeship Program for Registered Nurses, the National Student Defense Loan Program and the Nurse Training Act Program the proportion of respondents that used them as sources of financial aid through UTCN increased while the proportion that sought financial assistance from other sources, including part–time employment, decreased from their peaks in the early 1960s.

On the subject of personal history since graduation it was established that "the South" retained over 80% of the respondents as residents during the period of the study and that respondents who stayed in the East South Central Region (including Tennessee) had approximately the same rate of employment in nursing as did the total population of respondents, regardless of location.

On the subject of marital status it was evident that approximately 80% of respondents were currently or had previously been married; the rate of divorce indicated that respondents maintained more stable marital relationships than the total U.S. population of the same sex and age groupings.

A tendency toward earlier marriages was evident among respondents in earlier Classes while the trend was toward later marriage among respondents in the later Classes. Two thirds of the respondents who married did so while attending UTCN or within one year after graduation; one out of every two respondents who married in this time span married a person who was either a student in a College at the UT Medical Units or a qualified practitioner in a health related field.

Since 53% of the respondents to the first questionnaire answered it just two years after graduation, it was not surprising to find that approximately 40% of them were childless at that time; nor was it surprising that in the second sampling, five years later, this proportion had dropped to 8% of those who responded; respondents with children up to 13 years of age constituted 42% of respondents on the first sampling and approximately 60% on the second sampling; the registered nurse program respondents were older than the generic program respondents; in the 25 to 45 year age bracket a greater proportion of the registered nurse program graduates had never married than was the case for generic program respondents in the same age bracket; the proportion of respondents in each program group that had children was the same, 57%; the average number of children per respondent was the same for both program groups on the first sampling, 1.17.

The occupations of approximately 85% of husbands of respondents fell into professional and business related categories; 68% of the husbands who followed a profession were in the health related professions.

On the subject of career choice it was established that approximately 30% of the respondents could not identify precisely what factor most influenced their choice of nursing as a career; family influences were identified by one fourth and nurses and other health related factors were identified by another fourth of the respondents as being the most important factor in their choices; teachers and active recruitment by nursing were identified by very few respondents as being the most important factor in their choice of nursing as a career.

Overall, respondents perceived that persons in the lower and middle classes of the general public felt favorably toward a career in nursing while persons in the upper class, although they approved of nursing as a career, felt less strongly about it and were indifferent to it to a greater degree; there was evidence of a slight shift, over time, toward perception of a more favorable attitude toward a career in nursing on the part of the general public.

On the subject of career satisfactions, the three most highly ranked reasons for being employed in nursing, beyond the financial one, were personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others; the three remaining options, career commitment, the people met on the job, and scholarship or traineeship commitment were ranked in sharply descending order.

Among respondents who were not employed in nursing, more expressed regret that they were not, in a ratio of 2 to 1, than indicated that they had no desire to be employed; among the total population the feelings about the attractiveness of nursing compared to work in other fields became increasingly positive related to the recency of graduation and the shorter period of time between graduation and recording the feelings. The likelihood of respondent thinking they would choose nursing again, on the basis of present knowledge, was consistently 80% or better; the writers suggest that the existance of the remaining respondents who expressed dissatisfaction with their choice, merits attention.

Married respondents, in a ratio of 4 to 1 reported favorable attitudes on the part of their husbands toward their being employed as nurses.

Respondents reported having an average of from four to five friends among former UTCN students and this average number was consistent regardless of differences in the length of time since graduation.

On the subject of activities, in addition to the practice of nursing, that are traditionally considered to be criteria of professionalism, previous and current membership in the American Nurses' Association was reported by 2 out of 3 generic program respondents and 9 out of 10 registered nurse program respondents; current membership alone was reported by 1 out of 3 of the former and 2 out of 3 of the latter; the percent of members who reported active and leadership participation in ANA was 33% at the local level, 15% at the state level and 3% at the national level; the registered nurse program respondent members reported a higher rate of active and leadership participation than did the generic program respondent members.

Current and previous membership in the National League for Nursing was reported by 1 out of 5 generic program respondents and 5 out of 10 registered nurse program respondents; current membership alone was reported by less than 1 out of 10 generic program respondents and by 3 out of 10 registered nurse program respondents; the percent of members who reported active and leadership participation in NLN was 35% at the local level, 25% at the state level and 5% at the national level; the registered nurse program respondent members reported a higher rate of active and leadership participation than did generic program respondent members.

Approximately 1 out of 5 respondents reported membership in one or more professional organizations other than ANA and NLN; the patterns of membership and participation for respondents in the two program groups were similar to the patterns identified in relation to ANA and NLN.

Approximately 1.5 out of 5 respondents reported membership in one or more voluntary health and welfare organization and 3 out of 5 reported membership in one or more voluntary community organization such as religious, political, civic or educational groups.

Current subscriptions to one or more nursing journals were reported by 3 out of 5 respondents; on the average, registered nurse program respondents subscribed to 1.5 journals, while generic program respondents subscribed to 0.8 journals per respondent.

As would be expected, the proportion of respondents who reported serving as consultants and public speakers, who published professionally and who participated in research projects increased over time; public speaking was the activity that was reported most frequently in both samplings but its rate of increase, over time, was less than that for the other three activities.

Responses from a modal group of generic program respondents who were continuously active in nursing throughout the period of the study were compared with responses from a control group of their classmates who were less active.

There were some differences in the family backgrounds of the respondents in these two groups. On the basis of education and occupation of the father, the families of modal group respondents represented a somewhat lower socio–economic class than did the families of the non–modal respondents; mothers of the modal respondents completed a higher level of education, on the average, and were employed outside the home to a greater degree, than were the mothers of non–modal respondents; modal respondents were members of slightly smaller families, on the average, than were non–modal respondents.

Respondents in the non–modal group married earlier and they married and remained married in greater numbers, than was the case with respondents in the modal group; they married men in the professions, notably the health related professions, in higher proportions than did their classmates in the modal group; they had more children and a greater proportion of children under 13 years of age than did the modal group respondents; they percieved their husbands as having less favorable attitudes toward their employment as nurses than did the married modal group respondents.

The responses from the two groups regarding factors that influenced the career choices they made were similar with one exception, the influence of persons in nursing and other health related fields was identified as important by more modal than non–modal respondents and the importance of this influence increased, over time, among them.

The attitudes they perceived the general public to have in relation to nursing as a career were, overall, favorable for both groups of respondents; however, the modal respondents perceived the attitude of the lower class to be more favorable and the attitudes of the middle and upper classes to be less favorable while the reverse was the case for the non–modal respondents; there was a shift toward perception of a more favorable attitude on the part of the middle and upper classes by respondents in both groups, over time.

Excluding financial reasons for being employed in nursing, respondents in both groups ranked their reasons similarly, citing personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others as relatively equally important and well above career commitment, people met on the job and scholarship/traineeship commitment.

Knowing what they knew when they made their responses, respondents in both groups reported that they would choose nursing again in a ratio of 4 to 1 if they had the decision to make again; modal respondents gave nursing a slightly better rating than did their non–modal classmates when asked to compare work in nursing with work in other fields.

Modal respondents reported having earned the master's degree in greater numbers than did non–modal respondents and more of their degrees had the major in nursing. As was to be expected they participated in professional organizations, subcribed to nursing journals, served as consultants and public speakers, partitipated in research and publications to a greater degree than did the non–modal respondents.

Model respondents suggested improvements in the services the College and the Alumnae Association provide the graduates that were directed predominantly to the College and concerned educational offerings, master's programs, while non–modal respondents suggested improvements in non educational alumnae services.

A higher proportion of modal than non–modal respondents requested the report of the findings of the longitudinal career pattern study.

The opportunity to criticize the questionnaire used in the second sampling was utilized by 12% of those who responded. These criticisms were distributed between favorable and unfavorable comments in a 1 to 2 ratio.

Suggestions for improvement of the questionnaire and requests for a report of the findings were made by 7% of respondents.

Suggestions for improvement of services to graduates from the College and the Alumnae Association were made by 20% of the respondents; these suggestions were equally divided between those dealing with the need respondents expressed to continue their professional education on the master's level and those dealing strictly with communication with and participation in the Alumnae Association.

The opportunity to identify things that were significant to them that the questionnaire had not included was utilized by 18% of respondents. Approximately half the significant things so identified had to do with the lives of the respondents as persons but not full–time employed nurses; this finding lent support to one criticism that was made of the questionnaire, that it was slanted toward those respondents who were active in nursing and those who had continued their formal education in nursing beyond the baccalaureate degree.

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

The background of the respondents was the first subject addressed in the second volume of the report of the study of the career patterns of graduates of The University of Tennessee College of Nursing 1954-1974.

OCCUPATION OF PARENTS

Information on the subject of father's occupation was requested in *Question 3 Q One:

"When you first entered the University of Tennessee School/College of Nursing Programs, what was the primary occupation of your father or guardian? (Circle one)."

There were 522 usable **responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency by occupational category in Table Q 3 #1.

Table Q 3 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Father of Guardian

Primary Occupation Father or Guardian	Responses N	%
Profession (teacher, doctor, lawyer, engineer, minister)	92	17.6
Business official or executive (manager, buyer, supervisor, personnel director)	90	17.2
Proprietor (self-employed business man, store owner, contractor, distributor)	81	15.5
Farm owner or manager	56	10.7
Skilled operator or machine operator (factory machine worker, bus driver)	38	7.3
Technician or semi-professional worker (lab technician, draftsman)	31	5.9
Clerical worker (bookkeeper, office machine operator)	18	3.4
Laborer	18	3.4
Service worker (policeman, fireman, waiter, barber, cook)	16	3.1
Other	16	3.1
Deceased	6	1.1
Retired	3	0.6
Farm worker	2	0.4
Total	522	99.8

---

*In this report the questions are not necessarily considered in the sequence in which they appeared in the questionnaires but rather, in such a way, as to present the data most logically and coherently.

**For response rates see Volume 1 Table A 1, Appendix A. The fact that 533 copies of Q One were returned does not mean that there are 533 responses recorded for every item in the reporting. Not every respondent answered every question; some questions answered were applicable to only a segment of the population. Thus, the total number of responses that forms the basis for statistical consideration on any one question is identified as the number of usable responses.

When respondents marked the retired or deceased option, they were asked to identify the father's former occupation. The former occupations that were specified were included in the count for the listed occupations. Therefore, the counts for the categories of retired and deceased include only those responses for which no former occupation was specified.

When respondents marked the "other" option, they were asked to specify an occupation. Some of the occupations that were specified could be included in the count for the listed occupations and this was done in the following cases:

the occupations of journalist, military officer, electron microscopist, certified public accountant and pilot were counted in the category of profession;

the occupations of service station operator and real estate agent were counted in the category of proprietor.

The occupations of the fathers that remained in the count of "other" responses were distributed as follows:

6 were postal clerks; 2 were foremen in industry; 2 were engaged in two occupations simultaneously, those of farm owner and factory worker; 1 father was described as disabled; in one instance it appeared that the respondent was describing a guardian rather than a father since the occupation was designated as seamstress; in two instances, the respondent had no knowledge of the father's occupation and in two instances no information was given.

The findings presented in Table Q 3 #1 indicated that

five occupational categories accounted for 71.5% of the primary occupations of the fathers of respondents, namely, profession, business official, proprietor, farm owner and skilled operator.

A comparison was made between the occupations of fathers of respondents who attended UTCN and Vanderbilt[1] School of Nursing. This comparison is limited to respondents who attended the generic program at UTCN and the four and five year baccalaureate programs at Vanderbilt. The responses for the 14 occuaptional options are grouped into the 4 large categories used in the report of the Vanderbilt study, namely, profession; business executive and proprietor; retired or decreased and "other" including salesman, clerical worker, farm owner, farm worker, technician, skilled operator, service worker, laborer and other.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 3 #2.

Table Q 3 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Father's Occupation in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Occupation of Fathers of Respondents	UTCN Generic Program Graduates Responses		Vanderbilt Four and Five Year Bacca. Prog. Graduates Responses	
	*N	%	**N	%
Professional	87	19.3	108	23.1
Business exec. & proprietors	145	32.2	205	43.9
Retired and deceased	5	1.1	68	14.6
All other	214	47.5	86	18.4
Total	451	100.1	467	100.1

No explanation is proposed in the report of the Vanderbilt study for the high proportion of responses in the category of deceased and retired fathers. The UTCN rate is more in line with expectations. The marked difference in the proportion of responses in the remaining categories may be related to the considerable difference in the costs of the two programs.

It was not possible to compare the data concerning the occupation of fathers of respondents in the UTCN study with the data in the NLN[2] study because of the lack of similarity of the categories used in the two studies. In the NLN study the respondent was asked to name the father's occupation and these responses were then categorized by the investigators.

[1] Donaldson, Mary Louise and Hereford, Julia J. A Study of School of Nursing Graduates 1930-1963 Vanderbilt University School of Nursing. Nashville 1965.

[2] Knopf, L., From Student to RN. DHEW Publication No. (NIH) 72-130 Table 21 p. 58

*Derived from Table Q 3 #4

**Donaldson, M.L., Table 5 p. 13

The percent of responses for 7 categories of occupations for respondents' fathers is presented, by Class, in Table A 1 in the Appendix.

The percent of responses for 7 categories of occupations of respondents' fathers, by 2 decade groupings of Classes is presented in Summary Table Q 3 #3.

Summary Table Q 3 #3. Percent of Response for 7 Categories of Father's Occupation by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

Occupation of Respondents' Fathers	Classes 1954-1964 Responses N	%	1965-1974 Responses N	%
Profession	33	13.6	59	21.1
Proprietor and business official	76	31.3	95	34.1
Salesman, clerical worker and technician	34	14.0	53	19.0
Farm owner and manager	40	16.5	16	5.7
Skilled operator and service worker	35	14.4	36	12.9
Farm worker and laborer	12	4.9	8	2.8
Retired, deceased, "other"	13	5.3	12	4.4
Total	243	100.0	279	100.0

The findings in Table A 1 and Table Q 3 #3 indicated that

the proportion of responses from graduates after 1964 was greater than from graduates prior to and including 1964 by more than 3 percentage points in only two occupational categories of fathers, namely, profession (7.5%) and salesman, clerical worker and technician (5.0%); it was less in only one category, that of farm owner and manager (10.8%).

The calculated Chi Square for independence for the 522 responses was 21.67. At the .05 level of significance for 6 degrees of freedom, the Chi Square critical value was 12.952. Therefore, the occupations of the responsents' fathers at the time the respondents entered UTCN were not independent of the calendar year of the respondents' enrollment.

A comparsion was made of the number and percent of responses recorded for each occupational option in Question 3 by respondents who graduated from the generic program and from the registered nurse program.

These findings are presented in Table Q 3 #4.

Table Q 3 #4. Percent of Responses for Father's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Primary Occupation of Father	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Profession	92	17.6	87	19.3	5	7.0
Proprietor	81	15.5	66	14.6	15	21.1
Business official	90	17.2	79	17.5	11	15.5
Salesman	38	7.3	37	8.2	1	1.4
Clerical worker	18	3.4	15	3.3	3	4.2
Farm owner	56	10.7	44	9.8	12	16.9
Farm worker	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0
Technician	31	5.9	26	5.8	5	7.0
Skilled operator	55	10.5	51	11.3	4	5.6
Service worker	16	3.1	14	3.1	2	2.8
Laborer	18	3.4	12	2.7	6	8.5
Retired	3	0.6	3	0.7	0	0
Deceased	6	1.1	2	0.4	4	5.6
Other	16	3.1	13	2.9	3	4.2
Total	522	99.8	451	100.0	71	99.8

The findings presented in Table Q 3 # 4 indicated that

there were 6 fathers' occupations for which there was a difference of greater than 3 percentage points in the proportion of responses from graduates in the two program groups; generic program respondents reported a greater proportion of fathers were in the professions (12.3%), were salesmen (6.8%) and were skilled operators (5.7%); registered nurse program respondents reported a greater proportion of fathers were proprietors (6.5%), farm owners (7.1%) and laborers (5.8%);

the proportion of registered nurse program respondents who reported that their fathers were deceased was proportionately greater by 5.2%.

Question 5: "When you first entered the University of Tennessee nursing programs, was your mother, or mother substitute, gainfully employed? (Circle one)."

There were 528 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency, in Table Q 5 #1.

Table Q 5 #1. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents at Time of Admission to UTCN

Employed/Not Employed Status	Responses N	Responses %
Not employed	283	53.6
Employed, full-time	213	40.3
*Employed, part-time	32	6.1
Total	528	100.0

---

*The term "part-time" employment used throughout this report means any employment that involves only a portion of a work week.

The number and percent of responses for mothers' employed/not employed status by Class, is presented in Table Q 5 #2.

Table Q 5 #2. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers at Time of Respondent's Admission to UTCN, by Class.

Class	Not Employed Responses		Part-time Employed Responses		Full-time Employed Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	12	52.2	0	0.0	11	47.8
1955	13	65.0	1	5.0	6	30.0
1956	18	54.5	4	12.1	11	33.3
1957	16	59.3	1	3.7	10	37.0
1958	24	68.6	1	2.9	10	28.6
1959	11	55.0	2	10.0	7	35.0
1960	14	70.0	0	0.0	6	30.0
1961	12	60.0	0	0.0	8	40.0
1962	12	54.5	2	9.1	8	36.4
1963	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
1964	11	55.0	1	5.0	8	40.0
1965	14	70.0	0	0.0	6	30.0
1966	18	64.3	0	0.0	10	35.7
1967	4	33.3	2	16.7	6	50.0
1968	15	40.5	1	2.7	21	56.8
1969	16	50.0	5	15.6	11	34.4
1970	19	51.4	0	0.0	18	48.6
1971	17	53.1	1	3.1	14	43.7
1972	10	45.5	1	4.5	11	50.0
1973	11	50.0	2	9.1	9	40.9
1974	16	41.0	6	15.4	17	43.9
Total	283	Av 53.6	32	Av 6.7	213	Av 40.3

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 5 between those made by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 5 #3.

Table Q 5 #3. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents by Decade Groupings of Classes.

Employed/Not Employed Status	Respondents in Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Not employed	143	57.9	140	49.8
Employed, full-time	90	36.4	123	43.8
Employed, part-time	14	5.7	18	6.4
Total	247	100.0	281	100.0

The findings presented in Tables Q 5 #2 and #3 indicated that

the proportion of mothers employed at the time their daughters enrolled at UTCN from 1961 to 1970 (Classes 1965 to 1974) was 8.0% higher than for the mothers of respondents who enrolled from 1950 to 1960 (Classes 1954 to 1964);

in the responses from only four Classes (1963, 1967, 1968 and 1974) was there evidence that the rate of employment among mothers reached the 58% estimated to be the national rate at the time of writing of this report.

A comparison was made between the employed/not employed status of mothers at the time of admission of respondents as reported in the UTCN study and the Vanderbilt[1] study.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 5 #4.

Table Q 5 #4. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Employed/Not Employed Status	Respondents in UTCN Study Responses		Respondents in Vanderbilt Study Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Not employed	283	53.6	525	73.4
*Employed, full-time and part-time	245	46.4	190	26.6
Total	528	100.0	715	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 5 #4 indicated that

as might be expected on the basis of the differences in fathers' occupations (and presumed incomes) previously referred to, the proportion of employed mothers is smaller in the Vanderbilt study.

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 13

*No distinction is made between full-time and part-time employment in the Vanderbilt study.

A comparison was made of the information available about the rate of employment of mothers of respondents in the NLN,[1] Vanderbilt[2] and UTCN studies.

The responses in all three studies related to the time at which respondents had entered upon the study of nursing.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 5 #5.

Table Q 5 #5. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers of Respondents in NLN, UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Study	Year of Admission (Approximate)	Employed Mothers Responses		Not Employed Mothers Responses	
		N	%	N	%
NLN Baccalaureate Program N 13365	1962-1967	5370	40.2	7995	59.8
Vanderbilt Total N 715	1927-1960	190	26.6	525	73.4
UTCN Total N 528	1950-1971	245	46.4	283	53.6
UTCN Classes 1954-1964	1950-1961	104	42.1	143	57.9
UTCN Classes 1965-1974 N 281	1962-1971	141	50.2	140	49.8

The findings in Table Q 5 #5 indicated that

the proportion of employed mothers reported in the UTCN study was appreciably higher than that reported on the NLN study and that the difference was greatest when the time periods involved most closely approximated each other;

the period during which the rate of employment among mothers in the UTCN study increased most markedly was the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

---

[1] Knopf, L., From Student to RN. Table 30 p. 64

[2] Donaldson, M.L., p. 13

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to the options concerning mothers employment, by respondents who were graduates of the generic program and of the registered nurse program.

The findings are presented in Table Q 5 # 6.

Table Q 5 #6. Percent of Responses for Employed/Not Employed Status of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Employed/ Not Employed Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not employed	28.3	56.6	230	50.4	53	73.6
Employed part-time	32	6.1	29	6.4	3	4.2
Employed full-time	213	40.3	197	43.2	16	22.2
Total	528	100.0	456	100.0	72	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 5 #6 indicated that

despite the relatively small number of respondents from the registered nurse program, they reported a considerably smaller proportion of mothers who were employed when the respondent enrolled at UTCN than was the case for generic program respondents.

Question 6. "What was your mother's occupation when you first entered The University of Tennessee nursing programs? (Circle one)."

There were 248* usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 6 #1.

Table Q 6 #1. Percent of Responses for Primary Occupation of Mother

Primary Occupation of Mother	Responses N	%
Clerical worker (office, bookkeeper)	81	32.7%
Profession (teacher, registered nurse, doctor, dietitian)	77	31.0%
Service worker (waitress, beautician, cook, practical nurse)	23	9.3%
Saleswoman (wholesale or retail)	17	6.9%
Skilled operator or machine operator	16	6.5%
Proprietor (self-employed business woman, store owner)	15	6.0%
Business official or executive (buyer, supervisor, personnel director)	11	4.4%
Technician or semi-professional worker (lab technician)	5	2.0%
Other	3	1.2%
Total	248	100.0%

The three occupations specified as "other" were included in the listed occupations as follows; newspaper reporter was included in profession; baby sitter (full-time) and dental assistant were included in service worker.

---

*This is 3 more than the 245 responses to Question 5 that indicated that mothers were full-time or part-time employed. Setting aside the possibility of coding error, another explanation of the discrepency is that 3 respondents who either did not answer Question 5 or who answered "no", may have answered Question 6 by giving the occupation the mother had followed at one time, though not employed at the time the respondent entered the College of Nursing.

Information concerning the occupations of mothers of respondents in the Vanderbilt[1] study is limited to the statement that professional occupations ranked first, clerical occupations ranked second and proprietory occupations ranked third.

As was the case in relation to occupations of fathers, it is not possible to compare the data concerning occupations of mothers in the UTCN study and the NLN[2] study because of the lack of similarity of the categories used in the two studies.

The percent of responses for 4 categories of occupations of respondents' mothers at the time the respondent enrolled at UTCN, by Class, is presented in Table A 2 in the Appendix.

The percent of responses for 8 occupations of respondents' mothers, by 2 decade groupings of Classes, is presented in Table Q 6 #2.

Table Q 6 #2. Percent of Responses for 8 Occupations of Mothers by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

Occupation of Mother	Respondents in Classes 1954-1965 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Clerical work	29	27.6	52	36.4
Profession	36	34.3	42	29.4
Service worker	14	13.3	11	7.7
Saleswoman	6	5.7	11	7.7
Skilled operator	9	8.6	7	4.9
Proprietor	7	6.7	8	5.6
Business official	3	2.8	8	5.6
Technician	1	0.9	4	2.8
Total	105	99.9	143	100.1

The findings presented in Table Q 6 #2 indicated that

there were four occupations in which the difference in the proportion of responses for the two decade groups was greater than 3 percentage points; the proportion of mothers who were employed as clerical workers had increased by 8.8% in the second decade over the first while the proportion who were employed in professions, as service workers and skilled operators had decreased by 4.9%, 5.6% and 3.7% respectively.

The calculated Chi Square for independence for the 248 responses (organized into 4 categories) was 6.30. At the .05 level of significance for 3 degrees of freedom, the Chi Square critical value was 7.815. Therefore, the occupations of the respondents' mothers, at the time the respondent entered UTCN, were independent of the calendar year of the respondent's enrollment.

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 14

[2] Knopf, L., From Student to RN., Table 29 p. 64

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to the options concerning categories of employment of mothers by respondents who were graduates of the generic program and the registered nurse program.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 6 # 3.

Table Q 6 #3. Percent of Responses for Occupations of Mothers by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Occupation of Mother	Total Population Response		Generic Program Response		Registered Nurse Program Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Profession	78	31.5	73	32.3	5	23.8
Proprietor	15	6.0	14	6.2	1	4.8
Business official	11	4.4	11	4.8	0	0
Saleswoman	17	6.9	16	7.0	1	4.8
Clerical worker	81	32.7	76	33.5	5	23.8
Technician	5	2.0	5	2.2	0	0
Skilled operator	16	6.5	14	6.2	2	9.5
Service worker	25	10.1	18	7.9	7	33.3
Total	248	100.1	227	100.0	21	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 6 #3 indicated that

there were five occupations in which the difference in the proportion of responses for the two program groups was greater than 3 percentage points; the proportion of mothers of generic program respondents was greater than that for mothers of registered nurse program respondents in the professions, and the categories of business officials and clerical workers by 8.4%, 4.8% and 9.7% respectively;

the proportion of mothers of registered nurse program respondents was greater in the occupations of skilled operator and service worker by 3.3% and 25.4% respectively.

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

Question 7. "What schooling did your parents complete? (Circle one for each.)" For fathers there were 523 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 7 #1.

Table Q 7 #1. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Father of Respondent.

Schooling Completed by Father	Responses N	Responses %
High school graduate	120	22.9
Some high school, not a graduate	97	18.5
Some college, not a graduate	94	17.9
College graduate	69	13.2
Grade school	65	12.4
Post-graduate	55	10.5
Technical or vocational graduate (include RN)	23	4.4
Total	523	99.8

A comparison was made of the education completed by father as reported by respondents in the UTCN, Vanderbilt[1] and NLN[2] studies.

These findings are presnted in Table Q 7 #2.

Table Q 7 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers of Respondents in 3 Studies.

Schooling Completed by Father	UTCN Study Responses		Vanderbilt Study Responses		NLN Study Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school graduate or less	282	53.8	174	37.3	6756	51.5
Some college	117	22.3	93	20.0	2586	19.7
College degree or better	124	23.7	199	42.7	3772	28.8
Total	523	99.8	466	100.0	13,114	100.0

[1] Donaldson, M.L. Figure 1 p. 12

[2] Knopf, L. From Student to RN. Table #23 p. 60

The findings presented in Table Q 7 #2 indicated that

fathers of respondents in the UTCN study ranked only slightly below fathers of respondents in the NLN study but considerably below fathers of respondents in the Vanderbilt study in the matter of education completed.

For mothers, there were 528 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 7 #3.

Table Q 7 #3. Percent of Responses for Schooling Completed by Mother of Respondent.

Schooling Completed by Mother	Responses N	%
High school graduate	148	28.0
Some college, not graduate	111	21.0
Some high school, not graduate	78	14.8
Technical or vocational graduate (include RN)	76	14.4
College graduate	52	9.8
Grade school	42	8.0
Post-graduate	21	4.0
Total	528	100.0

A comparison was made of the education completed by mothers as reported by respondents in the UTCN, Vanderbilt[1] and NLN[2] studies.

The findings are presented in Table Q 7 #4.

Table Q 7#4. Percent of Responses for 3 Levels of Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in 3 Studies.

Education Completed by Mother	NLN Study Responses		UTCN Study Responses		Vanderbilt Study Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school graduate or less	7292	55.1	268	50.8	194	41.6
Some college	3809	28.8	187	35.4	152	32.6
College degree or better	2145	16.2	73	13.8	120	25.8
Total	13246	100.1	528	100.0	466	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 7 #4 indicated that

mothers of the UTCN study respondents ranked slightly better than the mothers of respondents in the NLN study in the matter of a smaller proportion having completed only high school and a large proportion having completed some college; however, they ranked slightly less well than the mothers of respondents in the NLN study in the matter of graduation from college and graduate study;

the mothers of the UTCN study respondents ranked relatively equally with the mothers of the Vanderbilt study respondents in the matter of having completed high school; however, they ranked considerably less well than mothers of the Vanderbilt study respondents in the matter of a higher proportion of them having completed only high school and a lower proportion of them having completed college and done graduate work.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. Figure 1 p. 12

[2] Knopf, L. From Student to RN. Table 31 p. 65

The number and percent of responses for 4 categories of education completed by fathers and mothers of respondents for the total population and by 2 decade groupings of Classes is presented in Table Q 7 #5.

Table Q 7 #5. Percent of Responses for 4 Levels of Education Completed by Total Population of Fathers and Mothers of Respondents' and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

FATHERS						
Schooling Completed	Total Responses		Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school and some high school	162	31.0	100	41.0	62	22.2
High school graduate	120	22.9	50	20.5	70	25.1
Some college inc. technicial and vocational graduates (RN)	117	22.4	53	21.7	64	22.9
College graduate and post-graduate	124	23.7	41	16.8	83	29.7
Total	523	100.0	244	100.0	279	99.9

Table Q 7 #5. Percent of Responses for 4 Levels of Education Completed by Total Population of Fathers and Mothers of Respondents' and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

MOTHERS						
Schooling Completed	Total Responses		Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school and some high school	120	22.7	71	29.0	49	17.3
High school graduate	148	28.0	72	29.4	76	26.9
Some college inc. technicial and vocational graduates (RN)	187	35.4	74	30.2	113	39.9
College graduate and post-graduate	73	13.8	28	11.4	45	15.9
Total	528	99.9	245	100.0	283	100.0

The calculated Chi Square for independence for the 523 responses (education completed by fathers) was 25.64; for the 528 responses (education completed by mothers) it was 17.61. At the .05 level of significance for three degrees of freedom, the Chi Square critical value was 7.815. Therefore, the level of education completed by each parent was not independent of the year of the respondent's enrollment.

The findings presented in Table Q 7 #5 indicated that

the proportion of fathers with the least and the most education exceeded the proportion of mothers in the same two categories, that is, a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had less than high school graduation but a greater proportion of fathers than mothers had graduated from college and done post graduate work;

the proportion of mothers with the intermediate levels of education, however, exceeded the proportion of fathers, that is, a greater proportion of mothers than fathers were high school graduates and were vocational and technical graduates, (including R.N.);

the greatest difference in the proportions between the parents' educational levels was found among those who had some college but had not graduated, mothers exceeding fathers by 13 percentage points; next in descending order was the difference among those holding college degrees, fathers exceeding mothers by 9.9 percentage points; next was the difference between those who had not graduated from high school, the fathers exceeding the mothers by 8.3 percentage points; finally, the smallest difference was among those who were high school graduates, the mothers exceeding the fathers by 5.1 percentage points.

The increments of change in the levels of education completed by fathers from the first to the second decade of the study, in descending order of magnitude, were as follows:

18.8% decrease in the proportion of fathers with less than high school graduation,
12.9% increase in proportion of fathers with college degree and above,
4.6% increase in proportion of fathers with high school graduation
1.2% increase in proportion of fathers with some college and technical or vocational graduation (including R.N.).

The increments of change in the levels of education completed by mothers from the first to the second decade of the study, in descending order of magnitude, were as follows:

11.7% decrease in the proportion of mothers with less than high school graduation,
9.7% increase in proportion of mothers with some college and with technical or vocational graduation (including R.N.),
4.5% increase in proportion of mothers with college degree and above,
2.5% decrease in proportion of mothers with high school graduation.

A common base for comparing responses to Question 7 was developed by assigning a value of from 1 to 7 points to the levels of completed education. The grade school level was assigned a value of 1 point, some high school, not graduate, was assigned a value of 2 points and so on up to post graduate which was assigned a value of 7 points.

The levels of completed education for respondents' fathers and mothers are presented in terms of point values and by 2 decade groupings of Classes in Table A 3 Appendix.

The average point values were as follows:

	Fathers			Mothers	
	N	Average		N	Average
Total	523	3.79	Total	528	3.71
Classes			Classes		
1954-1964	244	3.37	1954-1964	245	3.48
1965-1974	279	4.15	1965-1974	283	3.91

These findings indicated that

there was little difference on the basis of average point values between the levels of education completed by the mothers and the fathers of respondents in the total population;

the level of education completed by the fathers, however, began at a lower level and ended at a higher level than was the case for the mothers;

with the exception of Classes 1955 and 1960, the mothers completed a higher level of education, by Class average, than had the fathers up to and including Class 1962; beginning with Class 1963 and excepting Classes 1966 and 1974, the fathers had completed a higher level of education, by Class average than had the mothers.

A comparison was made of the levels of education completed by respondents' fathers, by respondents' UTCN program. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 7 #6.

Table Q 7 #6. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Fathers, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Schooling Completed by Father	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school	65	12.4	49	10.9	16	21.6
Some high school not graduate	97	18.5	79	17.6	18	24.3
High school graduate	120	22.9	103	22.9	17	23.0
Technical/vocational graduate	23	4.4	20	4.5	3	4.0
Some college, not graduate	94	17.9	81	18.0	13	17.6
College graduate	69	13.2	65	14.5	4	5.4
Post-graduate	55	10.5	52	11.6	3	4.0
Total	523	99.8	449	100.0	74	99.9

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses for levels of education completed by mothers, by respondents' UTCN Program.

These findings are presented in Table Q 7 #7.

Table Q 7 #7. Percent of Responses for Levels of Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Schooling Completed by Mother	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade school	42	8.0	29	6.4	13	17.3
Some high school, not graduate	78	14.8	57	12.6	21	28.0
High school graduate	148	28.0	132	29.1	16	21.3
Technical/vocational graduate	76	14.4	73	16.1	3	4.0
Some college, not graduate	111	21.0	96	21.2	15	20.0
College graduate	52	9.8	48	10.6	4	5.3
Post-graduate	21	4.0	18	4.0	3	4.0
Total	528	100.0	453	100.0	75	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 7 #6 and #7 indicated that

the proportion of fathers that had completed high school, had graduated from technical or vocational school and had had some college, was practically identical for respondents in both the generic and registered nurse program groups; for the generic program group, the proportion of fathers who had not completed high school was smaller and the proportion who had graduated from college was greater than was the case for the registered nurse program respondents;

the proportion of mothers that had some college but were not graduates and that had done post graduate study was similar for respondents in both program groups; for the generic program group, the proportion of mothers that had achieved less than high school graduation was smaller than it was for the registered nurse program respondents, while the proportion of them that had graduated from high school, technical or vocational school and college was greater than for the registered nurse program respondents.

Question 4. "Did your mother receive any education in nursing? (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 4 #1.

Table Q 4 #1. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	Responses N	%
No.	467	87.9%
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	37	7.0%
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	25	4.7%
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	2	0.4%
Total	531	100.0

A comparison was made between the type of education in nursing that was completed by mothers as reported in the UTCN study and the Vanderbilt[1] study.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 4 # 2.

Table Q 4 #2. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers of Respondents in UTCN and Vanderbilt Studies.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	UTCN Responses		Vanderbilt Responses	
	N	%	N	%
No.	467	87.9	643	89.9
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	37	7.0	46	6.4
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	25	4.7	20	2.8
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	2	0.4	6	0.8
Total	531	100.0	715	99.9

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 14

In the NLN[2] Career Pattern Study it is reported that between 6.8 and 8.7% of the baccalaureate students who participated stated that their mothers were registered nurses. The findings for both the UTCN and the Vanderbilt studies fall in the lower end of the range for the national sample. No further breakdown on types of nursing education of mothers is reported in the NLN study.

The number and percent of mothers who were registered nurses, including those holding the B.S.N. is presented, by Class in Table Q 4 #3.

Table Q 4 #3. Percent of Mothers who were Registered Nurses, by Class.

Class	Respondents	Registered Nurse Mothers	
	N	N	%
1954	23	0	0.0
1955	20	0	0.0
1956	33	3	9.1
1957	27	2	7.4
1958	35	1	2.9
1959	20	2	10.0
1960	20	0	0.0
1961	21	1	4.8
1962	22	1	4.5
1963	7	2	28.6
1964	20	2	10.0
1965	20	1	5.0
1966	27	4	14.8
1967	12	1	8.3
1968	37	4	10.8
1969	32	4	12.5
1970	37	3	8.1
1971	32	3*	9.4
1972	22	1	4.5
1973	24	2*	8.3
1974	40	2	5.0
Total	531	39	Av 7.3

---

[2] Knopf, L., From Student to RN p. 12

*Includes one with B.S.N.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 4 recorded by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and respondents who graduated in 1965 and after.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 4 #4

Table Q 4 #4. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Respondents' Mothers, by Two Groupings of Classes.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	Respondents in Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
No.	221	89.1	246	86.9
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	14	5.6	23	8.1
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	13	5.2	12	4.2
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	0	0	2	0.7
Total	248	99.9	283	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 4 #3 and #4 indicated that

there was a trend toward more respondents having a registered nurse mother in the Classes that graduated in 1965 and thereafter than was the case in Classes that graduated in 1964 and before.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses concerning mother's education in nursing recorded by respondents who were graduates of the generic program and the registered nurse program.

The findings are presented in Table Q 4 # 5.

Table Q 4 #5. Percent of Responses for Nursing Education Completed by Mothers, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Nursing Education Completed by Mother	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No.	467	87.9	398	87.5	69	90.8
Yes, she is a registered nurse but does not have a bachelor degree in nursing.	25	4.7	20	4.4	5	6.6
Yes, but she did not qualify as a registered nurse.	37	7.0	35	7.7	2	2.6
Yes, she is a registered nurse with a bachelor degree in nursing.	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0
Total	531	100.0	455	100.0	76	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 4 #5 indicated that

a difference of more than 3 percentage points between the proportion of responses by the two program groups existed in only one category of responses, namely 5.1 percent more generic program respondents than registered nurse program respondents had mothers who qualified as registered nurses but did not hold the BSN.

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER AND NUMBER

Question 8. "Indicate the statement that best describes you in relation to your siblings. Count all siblings that lived past infancy. (Circle One)."

There were 529 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 8 #1.

Table Q 8 #1. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options.

Respondent's Sibling Birth Order	Responses N	%
The oldest child	196	37.1
None of these	135	25.5
The youngest child	133	25.1
The only child	65	12.3
Total	529	100.0

Data reported in the NLN[1] study on the birth order of siblings of respondents are presented in Table Q 8 #2.

Table Q 8 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Siblings Birth Order Options by Baccalaureate Program Respondents in NLN Study.

Respondent's Sibling Birth Order	Responses N	%
The only child	1101	8.3
The oldest child	5291	40.0
The youngest child	2918	22.1
None of these	3901	29.5
Total	13211	99.9

No data on sibling birth order of respondents are reported in the Vanderbilt study.

A comparison was made of the sibling birth order of the respondents from the generic program and the registered nurse program. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 8 #3.

Table Q 8 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Sibling Birth Order Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Respondent's Birth Order	Total Population N	%	Generic Program N	%	Registered Nurse Program N	%
The only child	65	12.3	58	12.7	7	9.5
The oldest child	196	37.1	180	39.6	16	21.6
The youngest child	133	25.1	113	24.8	20	27.0
None of these	135	25.5	104	22.9	31	41.9
Total	529	100.0	455	100.0	74	100.0

---

[1] Knopf, L., From Student to RN Table 10 p. 51

The findings presented in Tables Q 8 #2 and #3 indicated that

the oldest child option accounted for the largest proportion of responses from generic program respondents in the UTCN study and from baccalaureate program respondents in the NLN study;

the only child option accounted for the smallest proportion among respondents in all three program groups;

the youngest child and the "none of these" options accounted for equal proportions of responses among UTCN generic program respondents;

among NLN respondents and registered nurse program respondents in the UTCN study, the proportion of the "none of these" responses was greater than the youngest child responses; in fact among registered nurse program respondents in the UTCN study "none of these" accounted for the greatest proportion of responses.

Question 9. "How many living siblings did you have when you enrolled in the University of Tennessee nursing program? (Circle one)."

There were 529 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 9 #1.

Table Q 9 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings.

Number of Living Siblings at Time Respondent Entered UTCN	Responses N	%
One	174	32.9
Two	127	24.0
None	73	13.8
Three	71	13.4
Four	37	7.0
Five	29	5.5
Six	8	1.5
Eight or more	6	1.1
Seven	4	0.8
Total	529	100.0

Although the NLN study requested information about number of siblings, no tabulation of the responses was included in the report of findings. The Vanderbilt study did not request the information.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 9 between those recorded by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after.

The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 9 #2

Table Q 9 #2. Percent of Responses for Living Siblings by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

Number of living sibling at time respondent entered in UTCN	Respondents in Classes 1954-1964 Responses		Respondents in Classes 1965-1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%
None	35	14.2	38	13.4
One	79	32.1	95	33.6
Two	49	19.9	78	27.6
Three	28	11.4	43	15.2
Four	24	9.8	13	4.6
Five	18	7.3	11	3.9
Six	7	2.8	1	0.4
Seven	3	1.2	1	0.4
Eight or more	3	1.2	3	1.1
Total	246	99.9	283	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 9 #2 indicated that

there were four categories of number of siblings in which the difference in the proportion of responses for the two decade groupings was greater than 3.0 percentage points; the proportion of respondents who had two and three siblings was greater among those who graduated 1965–1974 than for those who graduated 1954–1964 by 7.7% and 3.8% respectively; the proportion of respondents who had four and five living siblings was greater among those who graduated in 1954–64 than for those who graduated 1965–74 by 5.2% and 3.4% respectively.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 9 by respondents who graduated from the generic program and from the registered nurse program.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 9 #3.

Table Q 9 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Siblings by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Living Siblings at Time of Respondents' Admission	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	73	13.8	65	14.3	8	10.8
One	174	32.9	163	35.8	11	14.9
Two	127	24.0	109	24.0	18	24.3
Three	71	13.4	58	12.7	13	17.6
Four	37	7.0	28	6.2	9	12.2
Five	29	5.5	19	4.2	10	13.5
Six	8	1.5	5	1.1	3	4.1
Seven	4	0.8	3	0.7	1	1.4
Eight or more	6	1.1	5	1.1	1	1.4
Total	529	100.0	455	100.1	74	100.2

The findings presented in Table Q 9 #3 indicated that

there were five categories of number of siblings in which the differences in proportion of responses for the two program groups was greater than 3.0 percentage points; the proportion of respondents who had no siblings and one sibling was greater among generic program respondents than among registered nurse program respondents by 3.5% and 20.9% respectively; the proportion of respondents who had three, four and five siblings was greater among registered nurse program respondents than among generic program respondents by 4.9%, 6% and 9.3% respectively.

FINANCIAL AID
FOR UTCN PROGRAM

Question 2. "Did you receive financial aid while attending The University of Tennessee School/College of Nursing? Exclude financial support from your family. (Circle the one providing the most aid)"

There were 496 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 2 #1.

Table Q 2 #1. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid.

Did you Receive Financial Aid?	Responses N	%
No. I did not receive financial aid.	246	49.5
Yes, from sources available through The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.	123	24.8
Yes, from sources with which I negotiated	69	13.9
Yes, from part-time employment.	58	11.7
Total	496	99.9

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to Question 2, by respondents who graduated from the generic program and from the registered nurse program.

The findings are presented in Table Q 2 #2.

Table Q 2 # 2. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial and by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Financial Assistance while attending College of Nursing	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
The College of Nursing Sources	123	24.8	77	17.8	46	71.9
Sources with which I negotiated	69	13.9	63	14.6	6	9.4
Part-time employment	58	11.7	56	13.0	2	3.1
No financial assistance received	246	49.6	236	54.6	10	15.6
Total	496	100.0	432	100.0	64	100.0

Traineeships funded by the Professional Nurse Traineeship Program and its predecessors were available to students in the registered nurse program throughout the period covered by the study. The noticably higher rate of use of financial aid available through UTCN among these respondents was largely attributable to the availability of the Professional Nurse Traineeships.

The percent of responses from generic program respondents for sources of financial aid, by Class, is presented in Table A 4 in the Appendix.

National Defense Student Loans became available to students through UTCN after 1959. Loans and scholarships funded by the Nurse Training Act of 1964 became available to students through UTCN after 1965.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of generic program respondents who did and did not receive financial assistance from UTCN, from other sources, and from part–time employment, in three groups of Classes designated on the basis of the availability of federal funds.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 2 #3.

Table Q 2 #3. Percent of Generic Program Respondents Who Received/Did Not Receive Aid by 3 Class Groupings Based on Availability of Federal Funds.

Generic Program	Federal Funds Available					
	Classes 1954-1959 None		Classes 1960-1965 N.D.S.L.		Classes 1966-1974 N.D.S.L. and N.T.A.L. & S.	
	Respondents		Respondents		Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received UTCN aid	3	2.3	7	7.9	67	31.9
Received other aid	9	6.8	24	26.9	30	14.3
Part-time employed	16	12.0	16	18.0	24	11.4
Recieved no aid	105	78.9	42	47.2	89	42.4
Total	133	100.0	89	100.0	210	100.0

It was beyond the scope of this study to determine how the cost of the program at UTCN may have influenced the findings presented in Table Q 2 #3. The findings, considered as they stand, indicated that

before federal loan funds became available to UTCN students, part–time employment was the source of financial assistance used by more students than was the case for all other sources, UTCN included;

as financial assistance became available through the National Defense Student Loan program and the Nurse Training Act program, the proportion of generic program respondents that used UTCN as a source of financial assistance increased and the proportion that sought financial assistance from other sources, including part–time employment, decreased from their peaks in the early 1960s.

Chapter 2

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

The personal history of the respondents since graduation from The University of Tennessee College of Nursing was the next subject addressed in this study.

REGION OF RESIDENCE SINCE GRADUATION

Question 47. "Where have you lived for most of the time since leaving the University of Tennessee program(s)? (Circle one area and underline the state)."

There were 515 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 47 #1.

Table Q 47 #1. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation.

Regions of the United States and	Responses	
Foreign Country	N	%
East South Central (Ala., Ky., Miss., Tenn.)	354	68.7
South Atlantic (Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., W.Va.)	51	9.9
West South Central (Ark., La., Okla., Texas)	31	6.0
Pacific (Alaska, Calif., Hawaii, Ore., Wash.)	29	5.6
Mountain (Ariz., Colo., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Utah, Wyo.)	13	2.5
Foreign Country	11	2.3
East North Central (Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wis.)	10	1.9
West North Central (Iowa, Kan., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., S.D.)	7	1.4
Middle Atlantic (N.J., N.Y., Penn.)	6	1.2
New England (Conn., Maine, Mass., N. Hamp., Vermont, R.I.)	3	0.6
Total	515	100.1

A comparison of responses was made on the basis of two graduation–response intervals. The findings are presented in Table Q 47 #2.

Table Q 47 #2. Percent of Responses for U.S. Region or Foreign Country of Major Residence Since Graduation, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Regions of U.S. and	Graduation–Response 3–13 years Responses N	%	Intervals 2 years Responses N	%
New England	0	0.0	3	1.1
Middle Atlantic	5	2.1	1	0.4
South Atlantic	32	13.3	19	6.9
East South Central	151	62.9	203	73.8
West South Central	15	6.3	16	5.8
East North Central	6	2.5	4	1.5
West North Central	5	2.1	2	0.7
Mountain	3	1.3	10	3.6
Pacific	16	6.7	13	4.7
Foreign Country	7	2.9	4	1.5
Total	240	100.1	275	100.0%

A comparison was made of the findings from the response to four questions on Q One and Q Two, all of which related to the geographic distribution of respondents.

Responses to Question 1, Q One recorded the geographic region in which the respondent had lived, primarily, before entering The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

Responses to Question 47, Q One recorded the geographic region in which the respondent lived most of the time after graduation from The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

Responses to Question 14, Q One recorded all the geographic regions in which the respondent had worked as a nurse, full–time or part–time, for one year or more, since graduation from The University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

Responses to Question 4, Q Two recorded all the geographic regions in which the respondent had been employed as a nurse, full–time or part–time, for one year or more, in the five year period since answering Q One.

The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 47 #3.

Table Q 47 #3. Percent of Responses for Region of Origin, Residence after Graduation and Employment, Q One and Q Two.

Regions of United States and Foreign Country	Region of Origins N=526 %	Region of Residence after Grad. N=515 %	Regions of Employment *Q One N=622 %	Regions of Employment ** Q Two N=231 %
New England	0.0	0.6	0.9	1.7
Middle Atlantic	1.7	1.2	2.0	3.0
South Atlantic	4.4	9.9	9.4	13.9
East South Central	79.5	68.7	64.5	53.7
West South Central	6.8	6.0	6.6	10.0
East North Central	2.8	1.9	2.6	2.2
West North Central	2.8	1.4	1.7	2.2
Mountain	0.0	2.5	3.5	3.0
Pacific	0.4	5.6	6.2	6.9
Foreign Country	1.5	2.1	2.7	3.5
Total	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.1

*Answered 1967 through 1976
**Answered 1972 through 1976

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for each region by graduates of the generic program and the registered nurse program. The findings are presented in Table Q 47 #4.

Table Q 47 #4. Percent of Responses for Regions of U.S. and Foreign Country of Residence Since Graduation by Respondents' UTCN Program

Regions of US and Foreign Country	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	3	0.6	3	0.7	0	0
Middle Atlantic	6	1.2	6	1.4	0	0
South Atlantic	51	9.9	47	10.6	4	5.5
East South Central	354	68.7	292	66.1	62	85.0
West South Central	31	6.0	29	6.6	2	2.7
East North Central	10	1.9	10	2.3	0	0
West North Central	7	1.4	7	1.6	0	0
Mountain	13	2.5	12	2.7	1	1.4
Pacific	29	5.6	26	5.9	3	4.1
Foreign Country	11	2.3	10	2.3	1	1.4
Total	515	100.1	442	100.2	73	100.1

The findings presented concerning regions of residence and employment since graduation provided evidence for the following conclusions:

while 90.7% of all respondents came from the three contiguous regions, the South Atlantic and the East and West South Central regions, (Table Q 47 #3) the percent of respondents replying 2 years after graduation who recorded living most of that time in the three contiguous regions was 86.5% and the percent of respondents replying similarly 3–13 years after graduation had only dropped to 82.5% (Table Q 47 #2); thus it seemed clear that "the South" retained the vast majority of its UTCN graduates, as residents, during the period of this study;

registered nurse program respondents displayed an even higher degree of regional stability (93.2%) than did the generic program respondents (83.3%) (Table Q 47 #4);

"the South" was relatively less successful in retaining respondents in employment in nursing than it was in retaining them as residents, 80.5% on Q One and 77.6% on Q Two (Table Q 47 #3);

respondents who stayed in the East South Central region, in full and part–time employment in nursing, had approximately the same rate of employment as did the total population; on Q one their responses were 64.5% of all responses indicating full and part–time employment in nursing (Table Q 47 #3) while the rate for full and part–time employment for the total population was 62.9% (Table Q 12 #1, Volume 1); on Q Two their responses were 53.7% of those recorded for all regions while the rate of employment for the total population was 53.3% (Table Q 12 #5, Volume 1);

responses that indicated employment outside the East South Central region were concentrated in the two contiguous regions and the percent of these responses rose from 16% on Q One to 23.9% on Q Two; the only other region approximately even the lowest response rate for any portion of "the South" was the Pacific region.

MARITAL STATUS

Question 49. "What is your present marital status? (Circle one)."

There were 530 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 49 #1.

Table Q 49 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options

Marital Status	Responses	
	N	%
Widowed	6	1.1
Divorced	14	2.6
Separated	2	0.4
Married	395	74.5
Never married	113	21.3
Total	530	99.9

A comparison was made of the responses recorded by persons who answered Questionnaire One from 3–13 years after graduation and by those who answered 2 years after graduation. The findings are presented in Table Q 49 #2.

Table Q 49 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Two Graduation–Response Intervals.

Graduation–Response Interval in years	Marital Status Widowed N	%	Divorced N	%	Separated N	%	Married N	%	Never Married N	%
3–13 N = 247	5	2.0	10	4.0	1	0.4	195	78.9	36	14.6
2 N = 283	1	0.4	4	1.4	1	0.4	200	70.7	77	27.2

The divorce rate for the 417 ever–married respondents was 3.36%; for respondents answering 2 years after graduation it was 1.9%; for those answering from 3–13 years after graduation it was 4.7%.

The distribution of the 530 responses for marital status, by Class, is presented in Table Q 49 #3.

Table Q 49 #3. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Class.

Class	Grad. Resp. Interv. Years	Resp-ondents N	Widowed %	Marital Status Divorced %	Separated %	Married %	Never Married %
1954	13	23	0.0	4.3	0.0	82.6	13.0
1955	12	20	5.0	5.0	0.0	85.0	5.0
1956	11	33	0.0	9.1	0.0	87.9	3.0
1957	10	27	3.7	7.4	0.0	77.8	11.1
1958	9	34	5.9	0.0	2.9	82.4	8.8
1959	8	20	5.0	5.0	0.0	75.0	15.0
1960	7	20	0.0	5.0	0.0	90.0	5.0
1961	6	21	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	14.3
1962	5	22	0.0	4.5	0.0	63.6	31.8
1963	4	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9
1964	3	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
1965	2	20	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0
1966	2	28	0.0	3.6	0.0	60.7	35.7
1967	2	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0
1968	2	37	0.0	0.0	0.0	78.4	21.6
1969	2	31	0.0	3.2	3.2	80.6	12.9
1970	2	36	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.4	30.6
1971	2	32	0.0	3.1	0.0	65.6	31.2
1972	2	22	0.0	4.5	0.0	81.8	13.6
1973	2	24	1.2	0.0	0.0	66.7	29.2
1974	2	41	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.0	39.0
Total		530	AV 1.1	2.6	0.4	74.5	21.3

A comparison was made between the number and percent of responses for each marital status option for generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 49 #4.

Table Q 49 #4. Percent of Responses for 5 Marital Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Marital Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married	395	74.5	352	77.5	43	56.6
Never Married	113	21.3	89	19.6	24	31.6
Divorced	14	2.6	9	2.0	5	6.6
Widowed	6	1.1	2	0.4	4	5.3
Separated	2	0.4	2	0.4	0	0.0
Total	530	99.9	454	99.9	76	100.1

The findings presented in Table Q 49 #4 indicated that

respondents in the registered nurse program group reported 20% fewer being married, 12% more being never married, three times as many being divorced and five times as many being widowed as was the case for generic program respondents;

the divorce rates for the ever married respondents were 9.6% for the registered nurse program respondents and 2.5% for the generic program respondents.

Questions 21 and 22 on Q Two requested information about changes in marital status since Question 49 was answered on Q One.

Question 21. "Has your marital status changed since you answered the previous questionnaire?"

There were 248 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 49 #5.

Table Q 49 #5. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status Q Two.

Change in Marital Status	Responses N	%
No	214	86.3
Yes	34	13.7
Total	248	100.0

The 34 responses that indicated a change in marital status were distributed among the 5 marital status options in Question 22 Q Two as presented in Table Q 49 #6.

Table Q 49 #6. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status, Q Two.

Marital Status as Result of Change	Responses N	%
Married	18	52.9
Separated	0	0.0
Divorced	9	26.5
Remarried	5	14.7
Widowed	2	5.9
Total	34	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to Question 21 Q Two by generic program and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 49 #7.

Table Q 49 #7. Percent of Responses for Change in Marital Status on Q Two by Respondents' UTCN Program

Marital Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Has changed	34	13.7	28	12.8	6	20.7
No change	214	86.3	191	87.2	23	79.3
Total	248	100.0	219	100.0	29	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to Question 22 Q Two by respondents of the generic program and the registered nurse program. These findings are presented in Table Q 49 #8.

Table Q 49 #8. Percent of Responses for 5 Options for Change of Marital Status on Q Two by Respondents' UTCN Program

Marital Status	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married	18	52.9	15	53.6	3	50.0
Separated	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Divorced	9	26.5	7	25.0	2	33.3
Remarried	5	14.7	5	17.9	0	0
Widowed	2	5.9	1	3.6	1	16.7
Total	34	100.0	28	100.1	6	100.0

Based on the combined data on marital status from Q One and Q Two it was evident that the 23 respondents who recorded having been divorced constituted 5.3% of the 435 respondents who recorded ever having been married; this compares with the estimated national divorce rate of 20% for women of similar age distribution; respondents in this study obviously maintained more stable marital relationships than the total U.S. population of the same sex and age groupings.

The number and percent of responses from the 93 respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample (Table Q 10 #16, Volume 1, p 39) to Question 49 Q One are presented in Table Q 49 #9.

Table Q 49 #9. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Marital Status Options

Marital Status	Responses N	Responses %
Widowed	0	0.0
Divorced	2	2.2
Separated	1	1.1
Married	65	69.9
Never married	25	26.9
Total	93	100.1

The number and percent of responses from the Two Year–Seven Year Sample to Question 21 Q Two are presented in Table Q 49 #10.

Table Q 49 #10. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Change in Marital Status Q Two

Change in Marital Status	Responses N	Responses %
No	71	76.3
Yes	22	23.7
Total	93	100.0

The 22 responses that indicated a change in marital status were distributed among the 5 marital status options in Question 22 Q Two as presented in Table Q 49 #11.

Table Q 49 #11. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for 5 Options for Change in Marital Status Q Two

Marital Status as Result of Change	Responses N	Responses %
Married	14	63.6
Separated	0	0.0
Divorced	5	22.7
Remarried	3	13.6
Widowed	0	0.0
Total	22	99.9

Respondents in this Sample answered Q Two seven years after graduation, whereas the interval since graduation for the total population ranged from seven to eighteen years. This may have bearing on the finding that the percent of responses for a change in marital status and for the change being to married status is considerably greater in the Sample than in the total population.

A comparison was made of the marital status of the respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample and the baccalaureate graduates in the NLN[1] study. Data for this comparison were derived from Table 1 in the report of the NLN study and the categories of marital status used in it were used in the comparison; this meant grouping the responses for widowed, divorced and separated in the UTCN Sample under the one category of formerly married. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 49 #12.

Table 49 #12. Percent of Responses from Selected UTCN and NLN Respondents for 3 Categories of Marital Status by 2 Graduation–Response Interval Groups

Marital Status	NLN G–R Interval 1 year Responses		UTCN G–R Interval 2 years Responses		NLN G–R Interval 5 years Responses		UTCN* G–R Interval 7 years Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	852	49.6	25	26.9	311	19.0	11	11.8
Married	846	49.3	65	69.9	1274	78.0	77	82.8
Formerly Married	19	1.1	3	3.2	49	3.0	5	5.4
Total	1717	100.0	13	100.0	1634	100.0	93	100.0

Admittedly, the two samples are not comparable in size and the graduation–response intervals are not identical; however, the trends are similar in the two samples, namely, the proportion of respondents who remained single decreased with time and the proportion who married increased with time;

the category of formerly married is not identical to the category of divorced but it was permissable to assume that it closely resembled it for purposes of calculating the divorce rate of the two samples; the percent of the formerly and currently married who were formerly married (divorced) for each sample and each graduation–response interval was: NLN at 1 year, 2.2%; UTCN at 2 years, 2.9%; NLN at 5 years, 3.7%; UTCN at 7 years, 6.1%; as would be expected, this again, indicated an increase in the divorce rate with the passage of time.

---

*This distribution of the 93 respondents was derived from responses to Question 49 Q One and Questions 21 and 22 Q Two in the following manner: of the 65 respondents who were married on Q One, 5 had been divorced in the interval between questionnaires, leaving 60 still married; of the 3 persons who were divorced or separated on Q One, all had remarried on Q Two; of the 25 respondents who were single on Q One, 14 had married on Q Two, leaving 11 persons in the single category on Q Two; the married category now had 14 newly married, 3 remarried and 60 still married, a total of 77. No respondents reported being widowed or separated so the formerly married category contains only the 5 respondents who reported a change in marital status to divorced since answering Q One.

[1] Knopf, L., RN's One and Five Years After Graduation, Table 1 p. 5

The overall findings for Question 49 Q One and Questions 21 and 22 Q Two were considered in light of the following;

the 248 respondents who reported on their marital status as changed or unchanged on Q Two, constituted only 46.8% of the group that reported on their marital status originally on Q One;

the graduation–response intervals for Q Two respondents ranged from 7 to 18 years whereas they ranged from 2 to 13 years for Q One respondents;

the N of respondents who reported on a change of marital status was relatively small and it excluded the Classes 1970–1974 which constituted 29.2% of the Q One respondents;

respondents in Classes 1970–1974, furthermore, were in the graduation–response intervals of 2 to 7 years, when change from unmarried to married status is higher than it is for the 7 to 18 year group.

The only data, therefore, that provide the basis for a path study are those for respondents in Classes 1954–1965 who answered the two questionnaires from 2 to 13 years and from 7 to 18 years after graduation, respectively, and the respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample who all answered 2 and 7 years after graduation.

The findings for these selected groups gave rise to the observations that

a majority of all respondents and all subgroups were or had formerly been married;

the marriage rate was highest among generic program respondents more than two years out of school and lowest among registered nurse program respondents;

the divorce rate among those who had ever been married was lowest among generic program respondents two years after graduation and highest among registered nurse program respondents.

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

Question 51. "When did you first marry? (Circle one)."

There were 419 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 51 #1.

Table Q 51 #1. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage.

Time of First Marriage	Responses N	Responses %
Married before first enrollment in UT nursing program(s)	33	7.9
Married before senior year of first enrollment	75	17.9
Married during senior year of first enrollment	57	13.6
Married within one year of first graduation from the nursing program(s)	147	35.1
Married between one and three years after first graduation	77	18.4
Married more than three years after first graduation	30	7.2
Total	419	100.1%

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses recorded for each of the six time options for first marriage by generic and registered nurse program respondents. These findings are presented in Table Q 51 #2.

Table Q 51 #2. Percent of Responses for 6 Options for Time of First Marriage, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Time of First Marriage	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Before first enrollment	33	7.9	11	3.0	22	42.3
Before senior year	75	17.9	71	19.3	4	7.7
During senior year	57	13.6	54	14.7	3	5.8
Within one year after graduation	147	35.1	134	36.5	13	25.0
Between one and three years after graduation	77	18.4	69	18.8	8	15.4
More than three years after graduation	30	7.2	28	7.6	2	3.8
Total	419	100.1	367	99.9	52	100.0

The percent of responses for the six options for time of first marriage, by respondents' UTCN program and by Class is presented in Table A 4, Appendix.

The findings presented in Table A 4 indicated that

respondents in the registered nurse program group had a markedly higher rate of marriage prior to enrollment in the College and a lower rate of marriage during enrollment than did the respondents in the generic program group; this was understandable on the basis of the differences in ages of the respondents in the two program groups (Table Q 48 #2);

a slightly higher proportion of generic program respondents married in the first year after graduation but the rates were relatively equal for the two groups for the period from one to three years after graduation;

marriage before enrollment was identified by registered nurse program respondents throughout the twenty–one years covered by the study but it did not appear among the generic program respondents prior to the Classes that enrolled in the early 1960's;

marriage during enrollment, prior to and during the senior year, accounted for only 7 of the 52 responses from members of the registered nurse program group (13.5%) while it accounted for 125 out of the 367 responses from members of the generic program group (34.1%)

the generic program respondents who were members of the Classes 1954 to 1963, of whom none was married prior to enrollment, numbered 174 or 47.7% of the generic program respondents to Question 51; of these, 65 or 37.4% were married while they were enrolled in UTCN;

the generic program respondents who were members of the Classes 1964 to 1974, of whom 11 were married prior to enrollment, numbered 193 or 52.6% of the generic program respondents to Question 51; of the 182 respondents in these Classes who were not married at the beginning of their enrollment, 60 or 33.0% were married while they were enrolled in UTCN.

An analysis of the responses to Question 51 was made to determine possible trends toward earlier or later marriage among generic program respondents. Since the sixth time option, marriage more than three years after first graduation, did not apply to all respondents, it was omitted from the analysis. Values of 1 through 5 points were assigned to the first five options, respectively, to establish a basis for comparing the responses, by Class. The finding of this analysis of the responses of generic program respondents to options 1–5 on Question 51 are presented in Table Q 51 #3.

Table Q 51 #3. Responses of Generic Program Respondents for Five Options for Time of First Marriage Using Point System, by Class

Class	Responses N	Average Points	Class	Responses N	Average Points
1954	14	3.6	1964	12	3.3
1955	13	3.6	1965	11	3.2
1956	26	3.7	1966	14	3.8
1957	18	3.8	1967	9	3.9
1958	21	3.5	1968	27	4.0
1959	13	4.5	1969	26	3.8
1960	14	3.1	1970	24	3.5
1961	11	3.3	1971	17	3.5
1962	13	3.3	1972	17	2.8
1963	3	3.3	1973	15	3.5
			1974	21	3.7

The findings presented in Table Q 51 #3 indicated that

in terms of an overall pattern, a tendency toward earlier marriages was evident in the responses of generic program respondents in Classes 1954 through 1964, while a tendency toward later marriages was evident in the responses of respondents in Classes 1965 through 1974; these trends are more clearly evident if the two extreme values, those recorded for the Class of 1959 and the Class of 1972, are disregarded.

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

Question 52. "What was your fiancé's activity when you became engaged? (Circle one)"

There were 416 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 52 #1.

Table Q 52 #1. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement

Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement	Responses N	%
A student attending the UT Medical Units	113	27.2
An undergraduate student, but not in attendance at UT Medical Units	66	15.9
A graduate student	27	6.5
A qualified practitioner in a health related field	46	11.1
None of these is applicable	164	39.4
Total	416	100.1

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses recorded for each of the five options for fiancé activity by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 52 #2.

Table Q 52 #2. Percent of Responses for 5 Options of Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Fiancé Activity at Time of Engagement	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Student attending UT Medical Units	113	27.2	107	29.4	6	11.5
Undergraduate student, non UTMU	66	15.9	63	17.3	3	5.8
Graduate student	27	6.5	22	6.0	5	9.6
Qualified practioner in health related field	46	11.1	45	12.4	1	1.9
None of these is applicable	164	39.4	127	34.9	37	71.2
Total	416	100.1	364	100.0	52	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 52 #2 indicated that

the proportion of registered nurse program respondents that used the option "none of these is applicable" was twice what it was for the generic program respondents; this is not surprising since three out of the other four options described activities of students and 42.3% of the registered nurse program respondents were married at the time they enrolled at UTCN (Table Q 51 #2).

Respondents who identified the fact that the fiancé was an undergraduate student attending The University of Tennessee Medical Units were asked to specify the College of attendance. The distribution of the 113 responses among the Colleges, Schools and Programs at the Medical Units is presented in Table Q 52 #3.

Table Q 52 #3. Percent of Responses for Fiancé Attendance at UT Medical Units by College/School/Program

The University Of Tennessee Medical Units College/School/Program	Responses	
	N	%
College of Medicine	62	54.9
College of Dentistry	29	25.7
College of Pharmacy	12	10.6
Graduate School – Medical Sciences	6	5.3
Medical Resident and Intern Programs	3	2.7
School of Social Work	1	0.9
Total	113	100.1

The number and percent of the 109 responses that indicated fiancé attendance at the College of Medicine, the College of Dentistry, the College of Pharmacy and the Graduate School of Basic Medical Science is presented by Class in Table Q 52 #4.

These 109 responses include the 6 from registered nurse program respondents who identified fiancés who attended the UT Medical Units (Table Q 52 #2).

The three respondents who identified fiancés as residents and interns were members, one each, of Classes 1959, 1961 and 1971. The respondent who identified fiancé attendance at the School of Social Work was a member of Class 1970.

Table Q 52 #4. Percent of Responses for Four UT Medical Units Colleges for Fiancé Attendance, by Respondent's Class

UT Medical Units College Attended by Fiancé

Class	Resp N	Medicine N	Medicine %	Dentistry N	Dentistry %
1954	5	4	80.0	1	20.0
1955	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
1956	10	6	60.0	4	40.0
1957	6	3	50.0	1	16.7
1958	4	2	50.0	1	25.0
1959	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1960	7	4	57.1	2	28.6
1961	8	8	100.0	0	0.0
1962	6	4	66.7	2	33.3
1963	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
1964	3	1	33.3	1	33.3
1965	5	3	60.0	1	20.0
1966	7	4	57.1	2	28.6
1967	3	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	7	4	57.1	2	28.6
1969	9	5	55.6	1	11.1
1970	6	3	50.0	1	16.7
1971	4	1	25.0	2	50.0
1972	8	3	37.5	4	50.0
1973	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1974	5	4	80.0	1	20.0
Total	109	62	AV56.9	29	AV26.6

Table Q 52 #4. Percent of Responses for Four UT Medical Units Fiancé Attendance, by
(Continued) Respondent's Class.

		UT Medical Units College Attended by Fiancé			
	Resp	Pharmacy		Basic Med. Sciences	
Class	N	N	%	N	%
1954	5	0	0.0	0	0.0
1955	1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1956	10	0	0.0	0	0.0
1957	6	1	16.7	1	16.7
1958	4	1	25.0	0	0.0
1959	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1960	7	1	14.3	0	0.0
1961	8	0	0.0	0	0.0
1962	6	0	0.0	0	0.0
1963	2	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	3	0	0.0	1	33.3
1965	5	0	0.0	1	20.0
1966	7	0	0.0	1	14.3
1967	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1968	7	1	14.3	0	0.0
1969	9	3	33.3	0	0.0
1970	6	2	33.3	0	0.0
1971	4	1	25.0	0	0.0
1972	8	1	12.5	0	0.0
1973	3	0	0.0	0	0.0
1974	5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	109	12	AV 11.0	6	AV 5.5

The findings derived from responses to Questions 51 and 52 provided the basis for these observations:

two thirds of the ever married respondents to Q One married either while attending UTCN or within one year after graduation (Table Q 51 #1);

fiancés attending The University of Tennessee Medical Units constituted 38.3% of all fiancés (Table Q 52 #1);

one out of every two respondents who married either while attending UTCN or within one year after graduation, married a person who was either a student in a College of the Medical Units or a qualified practitioner in a health related field;

the Classes of 1959 and 1967 were each unique; the former recorded no fiancé among the students in the Colleges of the Medical Units and the latter recorded no fiancé in either the College of Medicine or the College of Dentistry and twice as many attending the School of Basic Medical Sciences as attending the College of Pharmacy;

with only minor deviations, the pattern of fiancé attendance among the four Colleges, Class by Class, remained quite consistent; only during the late sixties and early seventies (years of enrollment of respondents as distinct from years of graduation) did the Colleges of Dentistry and Pharmacy attain equal rates with the College of Medicine in this regard.

The largest percent of responses, 18.3% came from married respondents, under 25 years of age with no children.

Next, in descending order of magnitude of the percent of responses were
14.0% from married respondents aged 25–45 years with no children
12.5% from respondents who had never married, aged 25–45 years
11.0% from married respondents with all children under 30 months of age
8.5% from respondents who had never married, age under 25 years
8.3% from married respondents with all children ages 2½ to 6 years
7.9% from married respondents with oldest child under 13 and youngest from 2½ – 6 years of age
7.0% from married respondents with oldest child under 6 and youngest under 30 months of age

Responses to these eight categories constitute 87.5% of the total responses to the twenty five categories.

Responses from respondents 21–45 years of age having no children constitute 53.3% of responses.

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

Question 48. "Please circle the code number of the one category which best describes your age and family situation. "Children" applies to one child and more."

There were 529 usable responses and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 48 #1.

Table Q 48 #1. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories.

Age and Family Situation	Responses N	Responses %
Age under 25, never married	45	8.5
Age 25–45, never married	66	12.5
Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0
Age 65 or more, never married	0	0.0
No children, age under 25	97	18.3
No children, age 25–45	74	14.0
No children, age 45–64	7	1.3
No children age 65 and over	0	0.0
All children under 30 months	58	11.0
Oldest child under 6, youngest under 30 months	37	7.0
Oldest child under 13, youngest under 30 months	19	3.6
All children ages 2½ to 6 years	44	8.3
Oldest child under 13 years, youngest 2½–6	42	7.9
All children ages 6–13 years	21	4.0
Oldest child under 20, youngest under 2½	2	0.4
Oldest child under 20, youngest 2½–6	3	0.6
Oldest child under 20 youngest 6–13	6	1.1
All children ages 13–20 years	3	0.6
Oldest child left household, youngest under 2½	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 2½–6	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 6–13	0	0.0
Oldest child left household youngest 13–20	1	0.2
Oldest child left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0
Ages 45–65, all children gone from household	4	0.8
Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0
Total	529	100.1

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses recorded in each category by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 48 #2.

Table Q 48 #2. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories by Respondents' UTCN Program

Age and Family Situation	Total Population Responses N	Total Population Responses %	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
Age under 25, never married	45	8.5	45	9.9	0	0.0
Age 25–45 never married	66	12.5	43	9.5	23	31.1
Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Age 65 or more never married	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No children–age under 25	97	18.3	97	21.3	0	0.0
No children–age 25–45	74	14.0	59	13.0	15	20.3
No children–age 45–64	7	1.3	0	0.0	7	9.5
No children–age 65 or over	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
All children under 30 months	58	11.0	54	11.9	4	5.4
Oldest under 6, youngest under 30 months	37	7.0	35	7.7	2	2.7
Oldest under 13 youngest under 30 months	19	3.6	19	4.2	0	0.0
All children 2½–6	44	8.3	42	9.2	2	2.7
Oldest under 13, youngest 2½–6	42	7.9	39	8.6	3	4.1
All children ages 6–13	21	4.0	18	4.0	3	4.1
Oldest under 20, youngest under 2½	2	0.4	1	0.2	1	1.4
Oldest under 20, youngest 2½–6	3	0.6	1	0.2	2	2.7
Oldest under 20, youngest 6–13	6	1.1	1	0.2	5	6.8
All children ages 13–20	3	0.6	1	0.2	2	2.7
Oldest left houshold, youngest under 2½	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oldest left household, youngest 2½–6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oldest left household, youngest 6–13	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Oldest left household, youngest 13–20	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	1.4
Oldest left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ages 45–65, all children gone from household	4	0.8	0	0.0	4	5.4
Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	529	100.1	455	100.1	74	100.3

The findings in Table Q 48 #2 indicated that

respondents in the registered nurse program group were older than those in the generic program group

in the 25–45 year age bracket a higher proportion of registered nurse program respondents had never married than was the case for the generic program respondents.

the proportion of respondents in each group that had children was the same, 57% of respondents.

Question 48 was repeated on Q Two as Question 23. There were 213 usable responses to Question 23 Q Two and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 48 #3.

Table Q 48 #3. Percent of Responses for 25 Age and Family Situation Categories Q Two.

Age and Family Situation	Responses N	%
Age under 25, never married	0	0.0
Age 25–45, never married	25	11.7
Age 45–65 never married	2	0.9
Age 65 or more, never married	0	0.0
No children, age under 25	0	0.0
No children, age 25–45	12	5.6
No children age 45–64	4	1.9
No children, age 65 and over	1	0.5
All children under 30 months	10	4.7
Oldest child under 6, youngest under 30 months	28	13.1
Oldest child under 13, youngest under 30 months	22	10.3
All children ages 2½–6 years	22	10.3
Oldest child under 13, youngest 2½–6 years	*Omitted from Q Two	
All children ages 6–13 years	32	15.0
Oldest child under 20, youngest under 2½ yrs	*Omitted from Q Two	
Oldest child under 20, youngest 2½–6 years	11	5.2
Oldest child under 20, youngest 6–13 years	29	13.6
All children ages 13 to 20 years	10	4.7
Oldest child left household, youngest under 2½ yrs	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 2½–6 years	0	0.0
Oldest child left household, youngest 6–13 years	1	0.5
Oldest child left household, youngest 13–20 years	2	0.9
Oldest child left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0
Age 45–65, all children gone from household	2	0.9
Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0
Total	213	99.8

*Due to typographical error

The findings presented in Tables Q 48 #1 and #3 were not interpreted for the following reasons:

the omissions of data due to errors in Q Two diluted the value of the findings;

although the respondents who answered Q Two were relatively representative of those who answered Q One in terms of rate of employment (Table Q 10 #9 p. 32, Volume 1) there was no foundation for assuming that they were representative of the Q One respondent population in the matter of age and family situation. In fact, the data indicated that they were not.

The number and percent of responses from 92 of the persons in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample to Question 48 Q One and Question 23 Q Two are presented in Table Q 48 #4.

Table Q 48 #4. Percent of Responses from Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Age and Family Situation Categories by Q One and Q Two

Questionnaire One Responses		Age and Family Situation	Questionnaire Two Responses	
N	Percent		N	Percent
17	18.5	Age under 25, never married	0	0
7	7.6	Age 25–45 never married	12	17.0
0	0.0	Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0
0	0.0	Age 65 or more never married	0	0.0
36	39.1	No children, age under 25	0	0.0
13	14.1	No children, age 25–45	7	9.9
0	0.0	No children, age 45–65	1	1.4
0	0.0	No children, age 65 and over	0	0.0
11	12.0	All children under 30 months	8	11.3
1	1.1	Oldest under 6, youngest under 30 mos.	20	28.2
0	0.0	Oldest under 13, youngest under 30 mos.	1	1.4
3	3.3	All children, ages 2½–6	13	18.3
1	1.1	Oldest under 13 youngest 2½–6	Omitted	
0	0.0	All children ages 6 to 13	3	4.2
0	0.0	Oldest under 20, youngest under 2½	Omitted	
0	0.0	Oldest under 20, youngest 2½ to 6	3	4.2
1	1.1	Oldest under 20 youngest 6 to 13	0	0.0
0	0.0	All children ages 13 to 20	1	1.4
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest under 2½	0	0.0
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest 2½–6	0	0.0
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest 6–13	0	0.0
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest 13–20	1	1.4
0	0.0	Oldest left household, youngest over 20	0	0.0
2	2.2	Age 45–65, from household all children gone	1	1.4
0	0.0	Age 65 or more, have children	0	0.0
92	100.1	Total	*71	100.1

*The 21 missing respondents were in the categories that were omitted by error

The findings in Table Q 48 #4 indicated that

in the five year period between questionnaires, unmarried respondents married to the extent that only 12, 13.0% of the sample of 92 respondents, remained unmarried at the end of the five year interval.

family situations in which all children were under the age of 6 years rose from 16.4% of the responses on Q One to 44.6% of the sample of 92 respondents at the end of the five year interval. The implication was that, not only the respondents who married during the five year interval but also a fair number of those who were married on Q One, still had children under six years of age by the time they had been out of school for seven years. Again, by implication, this finding supports the fact that the sharp drop in the rate of employment among respondents came in the fifth to seventh year after graduation (Table Q 12 #7 Volume 1).

Question 50: "How many children do you have now living? (Circle one)."

There were 421 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 50 #1.

Table Q 50 #1. Percent of Responses for 7 Options for Number of Living Children

Number of Living Children	Responses N	Responses %
None	185	43.9
One	78	18.5
Two	84	20.0
Three	53	12.6
Four	19	4.5
Five	1	0.2
Six or more	1	0.2
Total	421	99.9

These findings and those for Questions 48 and 49 were reviewed to determine why only 421 persons responded to question 50 while 529 responded to Question 48 and 530 responded to Question 49. Respondents were divided into two categories, those that reported having children and those that reported having no children. The findings were as follows:

	Question 48	Question 50
	Options 1–8	Option 1
Respondents with no children	N= 289	N= 185
Respondents with children	Options 9–25 N= 240	Options 2–7 N= 236

It appeared that, understandably, 104 of the 113 respondents who recorded in Question 49 (marital status) that they had never married, did not answer Question 50. The 185 respondents that recorded that they had no children in Question 50 corresponds relatively closely to the 178 who reported that they were married and had no children in Question 48.

The findings in Table Q 50 #1 indicated that the average number of children per respondent was 1.17.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses in each category of number of living children for generic program and registered nurse program respondents.

These findings are presented in Table Q 50 #2.

Table Q 50 #2. Percent of Responses for 7 Options of Number of Living Children by Respondents' UTCN Program

Number of Living Children	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	185	43.9	159	43.2	26	49.0
One	78	18.5	73	19.8	5	9.4
Two	84	20.0	70	19.0	14	26.4
Three	53	12.6	47	12.8	6	11.3
Four	19	4.5	19	5.2	0	0.0
Five	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	1.9
Six or more	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	1.9
Total	421	99.9	368	100.0	53	99.9

The findings in Table Q 50 #2 indicated that the average number of children per respondent for both program groups was the same, 1.17.

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

Question 55: "What is (was) your husband's occupation? (Circle one)."

There were 332 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 55 #1.

Table Q 55 #1. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband

Occupation of Husband	Responses	
	N	%
Professional (teacher, dentist, engineer, lawyer, doctor, minister)	205	61.7
Business official or executive (manager, buyer, factory supervisor, personnel director)	30	9.0
Student	28	8.4
Technician or semi–professional worker (lab technician, draftsman)	20	6.0
Salesman (wholesale or retail)	16	4.8
Proprietor (self employed business man, store owner, contractor, distributor)	9	2.7
Clerical worker. (office bookkeeper, office machine operator)	7	2.1
Skilled operator or machine operator (factory, machine worker, bus driver)	6	1.8
Service worker (policeman, fireman, waiter, barber, cook)	6	1.8
Farm owner or manager	2	0.6
Laborer	2	0.6
Retired	1	0.3
Farm worker	0	0.0
Total	*332*	99.8

*There is a discrepancy between the number of respondents who, in response to Question 49 Q One, (marital status) indicated that they were married or had at one time been married, a total of 417, and the number who provided information about the occupation of the husband, a total of 332. This discrepancy may be due in some part to the way the instructions were phrased for Questions 54 and 55. The instructions began "If not presently married,"– This statement was not meant to discourage those 22 persons who were widowed, divorced or separated from answering Question 55 but it may have done so if they did not read the remainder of the instructions which asked them to answer Questions 54 and 55 in terms of their former husbands. It appears that the 103 persons who reported being married at one time, but who did not answer Question 54 concerning the husband's attitude toward their employment as nurses (Table Q 54 #1 Chapter 3) and the 85 persons who, although they recorded being married at one time, did not answer Question 55 concerning the husband's occupation, simply preferred not to give this information about their husbands.

Using four broad categories of occupations it was possible to collapse the responses to the thirteen options in Question 55 as presented in Table Q 55 #2.

Table Q 55 #2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband

Categories of Occupation of Husband	Responses N	Responses %
Professional	205	61.7
Business related; proprietor, business official, salesman, clerical worker, farm owner or manager, technician or semi professional worker	*85	25.6
Service or labor related; skilled operator or machine operator, service worker, laborer, farm worker	14	4.2
Student	28	8.4
Total	332	99.9

The percent of responses in these four categories, by Class, is presented in Table Q 55 #3.

---

*Includes one response recorded under retired; former occupation was proprietor

Table Q 55 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Class.

Class	Occupation of Husband Respon–dent N	Grad-Resp. Int. Years	Professional N	%	Business Related N	%
1954	18	13	14	77.7	3	16.6
1955	17	12	9	52.9	8	47.1
1956	28	11	21	75.0	4	14.3
1957	19	10	14	73.7	4	21.1
1958	26	9	14	53.8	12	46.2
1959	16	8	8	50.0	6	37.5
1960	13	7	11	84.6	2	15.4
1961	13	6	10	76.9	2	15.4
1962	13	5	7	53.8	5	38.5
1963	4	4	3	75.0	1	25.0
1964	9	3	5	55.6	1	11.1
1965	12	2	5	41.7	3	25.0
1966	13	2	9	69.2	2	15.4
1967	8	2	4	50.0	1	12.5
1968	23	2	15	65.2	6	26.1
1969	20	2	7	35.0	8	40.0
1970	20	2	12	60.0	2	10.0
1971	12	2	7	58.3	3	25.0
1972	16	2	10	62.5	3	18.8
1973	15	2	8	53.3	6	40.0
1974	17	2	12	70.6	3	17.6
Totals	332		205	AV 61.7	85	AV 25.6

Table Q 55 #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Class. (Continued)

Class	Occupation of Husband					
	Respon–dent N	Grad–Resp. Int. Years	Service and Labor Related N	%	Student N	%
1954	18	13	1	5.5	0	0.0
1955	17	12	0	0.0	0	0.0
1956	28	11	1	3.6	2	7.1
1957	19	10	0	0.0	1	5.3
1958	26	9	0	0.0	0	0.0
1959	16	8	1	6.3	1	6.3
1960	13	7	0	0.0	0	0.0
1961	13	6	0	0.0	1	7.7
1962	13	5	1	7.7	0	0.0
1963	4	4	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	9	3	1	11.1	2	22.2
1965	12	2	1	8.3	3	25.0
1966	13	2	1	7.7	1	7.7
1967	8	2	1	12.5	2	25.0
1968	23	2	0	0.0	2	8.7
1969	20	2	2	10.0	3	15.0
1970	20	2	1	5.0	5	25.0
1971	12	2	2	16.7	0	0.0
1972	16	2	1	6.3	2	12.5
1973	15	2	0	0.0	1	6.7
1974	17	2	0	0.0	2	11.8
Totals	332		14	AV 4.2	28	AV 8.4

Based on two graduation–response intervals, a comparison was made of the percent of responses recorded for the 4 categories of husband's occupation. The findings are presented in Table Q 55 #4.

Table Q 55 #4. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Husband, by Two Graduation Response Intervals.

Graduation Response Intervals	Categories of Husband Occupation Professional N	%	Business Related N	%	Service/ Labor Rel. N	%	Student N	%
3–13 Years N = 176	116	65.9	48	27.3	5	2.8	7	4.0
2 Years N = 156	89	57.1	37	23.7	9	5.8	21	13.5

The writers consider this assumption is warranted, namely,

the differences of proportions of husbands in the four categories is due almost entirely to the difference in the graduation–response interval and the proportions will be equalized as some husbands who are in the student and service and labor categories move, with time, into the business and professional categories; the difference in the proportion of responses in the category of student for the two graduation–response interval groups is understandable on the basis of the difference in age of the respondents in the two groups; two thirds of the husbands identified as students in the 2 year graduation–response interval group have moved into the professional category by the time the respondent is in the 3–13 year graduation–response interval group.

Respondents who indicated that their husbands' occupations were professional were asked to specify the profession; the following were identified:

86 husbands were physicians including 2 orthopedic surgeons, 2 internists, 1 pathologist, 1 psychiatrist, 1 physician/researcher
27 husbands were dentists
18 husbands were pharmacists including 1 pharmacologist
15 husbands were teachers including 1 principal and 1 educational specialist
11 husbands were engineers
8 husbands were armed forces officers
7 husbands were optometrists
4 husbands were chemists including 1 biochemist
3 each were environmentalists, lawyers and accountants
2 each were pilots and ministers
1 each was a game and fish officer, a government career worker, a social worker, a systems analyst, a marketing specialist, a real estate appraiser, an insurance adjuster, a bacteriologist, a veterinarian, a physicist, a psychologist, a musician

in 4 cases there was no specification; one retired husband had been a proprietor.

Using six categories of professional occupations it was possible to group these specified responses as presented in Table Q 55 #5.

Table Q 55 #5. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Professions of Husbands

Profession of Husband	Responses N	%
Health related; physician, dentist, pharmacist, optometrist	138	68.7
Education related; teacher, principal, specialist	15	7.5
Engineer	11	5.5
Lawyer	3	1.5
Minister	2	1.0
All others that were specified	32	15.9
Total	201	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 55 recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 55 #6.

Table Q 55 #6. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation by Respondents' UTCN Program

Occupation of Husband	Total Population Responses N	%	General Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Professional	205	61.7	189	64.3	16	43.2
Proprietor	9	2.7	3	1.0	5	13.5
Business Official	30	9.0	25	8.5	5	13.5
Salesman	16	4.8	13	4.4	3	8.1
Clerical Workers	7	2.1	7	2.4	0	0.0
Farm Owner	2	0.6	2	0.7	0	0.0
Farm Worker	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Technician	20	6.0	18	6.1	2	5.4
Skilled Operator	6	1.8	4	1.4	2	5.4
Service Worker	6	1.8	4	1.4	2	5.4
Laborer	2	0.6	1	0.3	1	2.7
Student	28	8.4	28	9.5	0	0.0
Retired	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	2.7
Total	332	99.8	294	100.0	37	99.9

Using the 4 categories of husband's occupation that were established previously it was possible to collapse these responses as presented in Table Q 55 #7.

Table Q 55 #7. Percent of Responses for Occupation of Husband in 4 Categories, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Large Categories of Occupations	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Professional	205	61.7	189	64.3	16	43.2
Business Related	* 85	25.6	68	23.1	*16	43.2
Service–Labor Related	14	4.2	9	3.1	5	13.5
Student	28	8.4	28	9.5	0	0.0
Total	332	99.9	294	100.0	37	99.9

The findings presented in Table Q 55 #7 indicated that

although the categories of professional and business related occupations accounted for more than 85% of the husbands' occupations in both the generic and registered nurse program groups, the distribution of responses between these two categories was dissimilar for the two groups of respondents; for the generic program respondents, there were three times the number of husbands in professional occupations as in business related occupations for the registered nurse program respondents, the distribution was equal in these two occupation categories.

**Includes one response recorded under retired; former occupation was proprietor*

A comparison was made of the specified professions that were provided by respondents who identified the occupation of the husband as professional. The responses were collapsed into the six categories developed previously and they are presented, by the respondents' UTCN program in Table Q 55 #8.

Table Q 55 #8. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Specified Profession of Husband, by Respondents' UTCN Program

Categories of Profession of Husband	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Health Related Professions	138	68.7	132	70.9	6	40.0
Education Related Professions	15	7.5	11	5.9	4	26.6
Engineer	11	5.5	11	5.9	0	0.0
Lawyer	3	1.5	1	0.5	2	13.3
Minister	2	1.0	2	1.1	0	0.0
All others that were specified	32	15.9	29	15.6	3	20.0
Total	201	100.1	186	99.9	15	99.9

The findings in Table Q 55 #8 indicated that

a higher proportion of generic program respondents were married to husbands in the health related professions and engineering than was the case for registered nurse program respondents;

a higher proportion of registered nurse program respondents were married to husbands in the education related professions and the legal profession than was the case for the generic program respondents;

the proportion married to husbands in all the other professions that were specified was relatively equal for both program groups.

These interpretations of the findings must be considered with due attention to the small number of respondents in the registered nurse program group.

Question 53: "Is your husband presently in the armed forces? (Circle one)."

There were 413 usable responses:

71 (17.2%) answered "yes"; 342 (82.8%) answered "no".

The years in which this question was answered were 1967 through 1976. The percent of positive responses, by the year in which the response was made, is presented in Table Q 53 #1.

Table Q 53 #1. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces, by Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval

Graduation – Response Interval	Year in Which Response Was Recorded	Percent of Positive Responses Made Each Year
3–13 years	1967	AV. 12.2%
2 years	1968	27.8
2 years	1969	44.4
2 years	1970	24.1
2 years	1971	25.0
2 years	1972	12.0
2 years	1973	23.8
2 years	1974	15.8
2 years	1975	17.6
2 years	1976	28.0

The writers surmised that the high proportion of respondents with husbands in the armed forces was related to the Vietnam War years and the age of the respondent, the presumed age of the husband and his eligibility for military service.

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses to the two options in Question 53 by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 53 #2.

Table Q 53 #2. Percent of Responses for Husband's Status with Armed Forces, by Respondents' UTCN Program

"Is your husband presently in the armed forces?"	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Yes	71	17.2	68	18.7	3	6.1
No	342	82.8	296	81.3	46	93.9
Total	413	100.0	364	100.0	49	100.0

The writers surmised that the differences evident here may have been related directly to the age brackets of the two groups of respondents.

The percent of positive responses, by the year in which the response was made by two graduation–response intervals and by the respondents' UTCN program is presented in Table Q 53 #3.

Table Q 53 #3. Percent of Responses that were Positive for Husband in Armed Forces by Respondents' UTCN Program, Year of Response and Graduation–Response Interval

Grad.– Response Interval Years	Year in Which Response Was Recorded	Percent of Responses that were Positive. Generic Program Respondents N = 364	Registered Nurse Program Respondents N = 49
3–13	1967	AV 13.3	AV 3.7
2	1968	28.6	25.0
2	1969	44.4	0.0
2	1970	25.9	0.0
2	1971	24.0	33.0
2	1972	12.5	0.0
2	1973	29.4	0.0
2	1974	17.6	0.0
2	1975	20.0	0.0
2	1976	33.3	0.0
		AV 24.9	7.4

Chapter 3

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTIONS

The subjects of career choice and career satisfactions are addressed next in this study.

CAREER CHOICE

Question 57: "Which of the following factors do you feel most influenced your choice of nursing? (Circle one)."

There were 522 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 57 #1.

Table Q 57 #1. Percent of Responses for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing

Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Responses N	%
Parents or immediate relatives	130	24.9
Don't know	125	23.9
Other	91	17.4
Someone in the field of nursing	55	10.5
Summer job in hospital or health related field	49	9.4
Someone in the general health field, e.g. doctor, dentist	39	7.5
Teachers (at any level)	15	2.9
Active recruitment on part of nursing (e.g. brochures, clubs, films)	13	2.5
Financial pressures	5	1.0
Military experience	0	0.0
Total	522	100.0

Respondents who indicated that they had been most influenced by "other" factors were asked to specify the influence:

33 respondents identified personal desire to be a nurse;

10 each identified service to humanity and an interest in general science, and/or health related studies and/or medical sciences;

8 identified personal experience, as being a patient;

5 identified illness and/or death in the immediate family;

4 each identified a call to serve God and the personal and financial security of the occupation;

3 identified books and stories about nursing;

2 each identified experience as a volunteer, a friend, vocational aptitude testing results, and a desire to study medicine that was thwarted by insufficient funds;

1 each identified a need for personal fulfillment, the challenging nature of nursing, recruitment by a mission board, the parents of a child with whom she "baby sat" and the opportunity to combine the study of nursing with a college education;

1 respondent who marked the "other" option did not specify an influence.

Although Question 57 did not ask for information concerning the age at which the respondent made the choice of nursing, a number of those who used the "other" option included a statement to the effect that the choice was made in childhood; a number stated that the choice once made was permanent; a number stated that the choice was made so early that the respondent could not remember a time in her life that did not include the choice. These respondents totalled 20.

It was the judgment of the writers that the 33 respondents who stated that personal desire for nursing was the factor that most influenced their choice, offered in fact, no more definitive information than did the respondents who identified the option "don't know". When their responses are taken from the "other" option and added to the "don't know" option, the findings are as presented in Table Q 57 #2.

Table Q 57 #2. Percent of Responses (Reorganized) for Factors that Influenced Respondent's Choice of Nursing

Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Responses N	%
Don't know and personal desire	158	30.3
Parents or immediate family	130	24.9
Other	58	11.1
Someone in the field of nursing	55	10.5
Summer job in hospital or health related field	49	9.4
Someone in the general health field (e.g. doctor, dentist)	39	7.5
Teachers (at any level)	15	2.9
Active recruitment on the part of nursing e.g. brochures, clubs, films)	13	2.5
Financial pressure	5	1.0
Military experience	0	0.0
Total	522	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 57 recorded by the generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 57 #3.

Table Q 57 #3. Percent of Responses for Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program

Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parents or immediate relatives	130	24.9	114	25.6	16	21.1
Teachers	15	2.9	10	2.2	5	6.6
Someone in the field of nursing	55	10.5	41	9.2	14	18.4
Military experience	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Financial pressure	5	1.0	3	0.7	2	2.6
Summer job in hospital	49	9.4	47	10.5	2	2.6
Active recruitment by nursing	13	2.5	11	2.5	2	2.6
Someone in general health field	39	7.5	32	7.2	7	9.2
Other	91	17.4	82	18.4	9	11.8
Don't know	125	23.9	106	23.8	19	25.0
Total	522	100.0	446	100.1	76	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 57 #2 and #3 indicated that

approximately one third of the respondents could not identify with any precision the factor that most influenced their choice of nursing;

approximately one fourth of the respondents identified family influence as being the most important factor in their choice;

approximately one fourth of the respondents identified nurses, other health professionals and employment in a health related field (combined) as being the most important factor in their choice;

the importance of contact with someone in the health field was underscored when the findings from Questions 3 and 4, presented in Chapter 1, were considered in this context; it was established in Question 4 that 12.1% of respondents' mothers had at least some education in nursing; a parsimonious estimate based on findings in Question 3, that one fifth of the fathers identified as having a professional occupation were physicians, produced a figure of 3.5% of the respondents' fathers; when this 15.6% was added to the percentages for "someone in the field of nursing", "summer job in a hospital or health related field" and "someone in the general health field", the proportion of responses for the influence of health professionals approached 45%; this finding suggested the central importance of personal contact with health professionals in the career choice of respondents in this study;

teachers and active recruitment conducted by nurses were identified by very few respondents as being the most important factor in the choice of nursing for a career;

the proportion of responses by generic and registered nurse program respondents was roughly equal for all the options with the exception of three; registered nurse program respondents identified teachers and nurses as being more influential and summer employment in a hospital or health related agency as being less influential in their career choices than did the generic program respondents.

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

Question 58: "How do you think each of the following classes in the general public currently regards a career in nursing? (Circle one number in each column)."

There were 522 responses recorded for the attitudes of the lower class, 525 for the attitudes of the middle class and 523 for the attitudes of the upper class. The percent of responses for the attitudes of the three classes are presented in Table Q 58 #1.

Table Q 58 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing

Attitudes toward Career in Nursing	Classes of General Public Lower Class Responses N	%	Middle Class Responses N	%	Upper Class Responses N	%
Very favorable	284	54.4	161	30.7	32	6.3
Favorable	176	33.7	308	58.7	188	35.9
Indifferent	56	10.7	43	8.2	214	40.7
Unfavorable	3	0.6	9	1.7	71	13.6
Very unfavorable	3	0.6	4	0.8	18	3.4
Total	522	100.0	525	100.1	523	99.9

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 58 recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 58 #2.

Table Q 58 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of 3 Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing by Respondents' UTCN Program

	Lower Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Responses			
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	249	55.8	35	46.1
Favorable	148	33.2	28	36.8
Indifferent	44	9.9	12	15.8
Unfavorable	2	0.4	1	1.3
Very unfavorable	3	0.7	0	0.0
Total	446	100.0	76	100.0

	Middle Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Responses			
	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	138	30.7	23	30.3
Favorable	264	58.8	44	57.9
Indifferent	36	8.0	7	9.2
Unfavorable	7	1.6	2	2.6
Very unfavorable	4	0.9	0	0.0
Total	449	100.0	76	100.0

	Upper Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Responses			
	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	30	6.7	2	2.6
Favorable	170	38.0	18	23.7
Indifferent	181	40.5	33	43.4
Unfavorable	52	11.6	19	25.0
Very unfavorable	14	3.1	4	5.3
Total	447	99.9	76	100.0

Combining responses recorded under "very favorable" and "favorable" into one category designated approving and combining the responses recorded under "indifferent", "unfavorable" and "very unfavorable" into another category designated disapproving, it was possible to compare the perceptions respondents recorded about attitudes by lower, middle and upper classes of the general public and by Classes of respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 58 #3.

Table Q 58 #3. Percent of Responses for Approving and Disapproving Attitudes of Three Classes of of General Public, Toward Nursing Career, by Respondent's Class

Respondent's Class	Lower Class		Middle Class		Upper Class	
	Approving	Disapproving	Approving	Disapproving	Approving	Disapproving
	Responses		Responses		Responses	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1954	86.4	13.5	76.1	23.9	33.3	66.7
1955	80.0	20.0	75.0	25.0	40.0	60.0
1956	84.3	15.6	87.5	12.6	40.6	59.4
1957	84.7	15.4	80.7	19.2	30.7	69.2
1958	88.2	11.7	82.3	17.6	23.5	76.5
1959	84.2	15.8	95.0	05.0	45.0	55.0
1960	75.0	25.0	90.0	10.0	45.0	55.0
1961	85.8	14.3	95.2	04.8	38.1	61.9
1962	85.7	14.3	95.4	04.5	52.4	47.7
1963	85.7	14.3	100.0	00.0	57.1	42.9
1964	95.0	05.0	80.0	20.0	20.0	80.0
1965	90.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	40.0	60.0
1966	85.2	14.8	96.5	03.6	21.5	78.5
1967	100.0	00.0	83.3	16.6	50.0	50.0
1968	94.6	05.4	83.8	16.2	32.4	67.5
1969	87.1	12.9	96.8	03.2	58.1	41.9
1970	86.5	13.5	94.5	05.4	64.9	35.1
1971	96.7	03.3	100.0	00.0	50.0	50.0
1972	95.3	04.8	85.7	14.3	47.6	52.4
1973	87.5	12.5	100.0	00.0	45.8	54.2
1974	90.3	09.7	90.2	9.7	51.2	48.8
Classes 1954–63	AV 84.0	15.9	87.7	12.2	40.5	59.4
Classes 1964–74	AV 91.6	8.4	91.0	9.0	43.7	56.2

The findings presented in Tables Q 58 #1, #2 and #3 indicated that

overall, the respondents thought that persons belonging to the lower and middle classes felt favorably toward a career in nursing while persons in the upper class, although still approving of nursing as a career, felt less strongly about it and were indifferent to it to a much greater degree than were persons in the lower and middle classes;

the perceptions of the generic and registered nurse program respondents were roughly the same in their assessment of middle class attitudes toward nursing as a career;

registered nurse program respondents thought there was a greater degree of indifference to nursing as a career among persons in the lower class than did the generic program respondents; otherwise, the assessment of lower class attitudes by the two program groups was similar;

the major differences in perception of attitudes between the two program groups appeared in relation to the attitudes of the upper class; both groups felt the degree of indifference toward a career in nursing was relatively high among the upper class; however, when the indifferent responses were set aside, it was evident that generic program respondents thought the upper class attitude was more favorable to a career in nursing than did the registered nurse program respondents;

there was an average of 3 percentage points increase, with time, in the favorable assessments perceived for both middle and upper classes when the responses from members of the Classes that graduated in 1963 and before were compared with responses from members of Classes that graduated in 1964 and after; for the favorable assessment by the lower class, this average was a 7.6 percentage point increase for the same Class groupings; this was interpreted as meaning that over the 21 years covered in this study, respondents perceived the attitude the general public had toward nursing as a career to have become slightly more favorable; most of the shift toward a more positive attitude was attributed to the change they perceived in the attitude of the lower class.

Question 58 was repeated, unchanged, as Question 27 on Q Two.

There were 238 responses recorded for attitudes of the lower class, 241 responses recorded for attitudes of the middle class and 239 recorded for attitudes of the upper class on Q Two. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table Q 58 #4.

Table Q 58 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q Two

	Classes of the General Public					
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Lower Class Responses		Middle Class Responses		Upper Class Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	153	64.3	74	30.7	15	6.3
Favorable	58	24.4	154	63.9	93	38.9
Indifferent	22	9.2	6	2.5	93	38.9
Unfavorable	3	1.3	5	2.1	31	13.0
Very unfavorable	2	0.8	2	0.8	7	2.9
Total	238	100.0	241	100.0	239	100.0

A comparison was made of the percent of responses to Question 58 Q One and Question 27 Q Two. The findings are presented in Table Q 58 #5.

Table Q 58 #5. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Classes of the General Public					
	Lower Class Responses		Middle Class Responses		Upper Class Responses	
	Q One N = 522 %	Q Two N = 238 %	Q One N = 525 %	Q Two N = 241 %	Q One N = 523 %	Q Two N = 239 %
Very favorable	54.4	64.3	30.7	30.7	6.3	6.3
Favorable	33.7	24.4	58.7	63.9	35.9	38.9
Indifferent	10.7	9.2	8.2	2.5	40.7	38.9
Unfavorable	0.6	1.3	1.7	2.1	13.6	13.0
Very unfavorable	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.4	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0

The total number and percent of responses recorded for each attitude as perceived for all three classes of the general public on Q One and Q Two is presented in Table Q 58 #6.

Table Q 58 #6. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing Q One and Q Two

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	General Public			
	Q One Responses		Q Two Responses	
	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	477	30.4	242	33.7
Favorable	672	42.8	305	42.5
Indifferent	313	19.9	121	16.9
Unfavorable	83	5.3	39	5.4
Very unfavorable	25	1.6	11	1.5
Total	1570	100.0	718	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 58 #6 indicated that

respondents to Q Two recorded perceptions that gave evidence of a slight shift, with time, toward more favorable attitudes toward a career in nursing attributed to the general public; the 3% shift occurred from the indifferent to the very favorable attitude; this shift is attributable differentially, however, to the three socio-economic classes of the general public, as evident in previous presentations of the data.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 27 Q Two recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 58 #7.

Table Q 58 #7. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing, by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two

	Lower Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
		Responses		
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	135	64.3	18	64.3
Favorable	51	24.3	7	25.0
Indifferent	20	9.5	2	7.1
Unfavorable	3	1.4	0	0.0
Very unfavorable	1	0.5	1	3.6
Total	210	100.0	28	100.0

	Middle Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
		Responses		
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	68	31.9	6	21.4
Favorable	133	62.4	21	75.0
Indifferent	6	2.8	0	0.0
Unfavorable	5	2.3	0	0.0
Very unfavorable	1	0.5	1	3.6
Total	213	99.9	28	100.0

	Upper Class			
	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
		Responses		
Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	N	%	N	%
Very favorable	14	6.6	1	3.6
Favorable	84	39.8	9	32.1
Indifferent	83	39.3	10	35.7
Unfavorable	26	12.3	5	17.9
Very unfavorable	4	1.9	3	10.7
Total	211	99.9	28	100.0

Responses submitted by respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Questions 58 Q One and Question 27 Q Two are presented in Table Q 58 #8.

Table Q 58 #8. Percent of Responses for Attitudes of Three Classes of General Public Toward Career in Nursing for Two Year–Seven Year Sample

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Lower Class Responses Q One N	 %	 Q Two N	 %
Very favorable	55	59.8	59	64.8
Favorable	28	30.4	20	22.0
Indifferent	9	9.8	10	11.0
Unfavorable	0	0.0	1	1.1
Very unfavorable	0	0.0	1	1.1
Total	92	100.0	91	100.0

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Middle Class Responses Q One N	 %	 Q Two N	 %
Very favorable	25	26.9	26	28.3
Favorable	58	62.4	59	64.1
Indifferent	9	9.7	4	4.3
Unfavorable	1	1.1	2	2.2
Very unfavorable	0	0.0	1	1.1
Total	93	100.1	92	100.0

Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing	Upper Class Responses Q One N	 %	 Q Two N	 %
Very favorable	4	4.3	3	3.3
Favorable	30	32.3	37	40.7
Indifferent	40	43.0	35	38.5
Unfavorable	15	16.1	12	13.2
Very unfavorable	4	4.3	4	4.4
Total	93	100.0	91	100.1

All the conclusions previously stated, that identified changes in perceived attitudes, must be interpreted cautiously because there are differences in the samples reporting on Q One and Q Two. Only in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample are the respondents identical for Q One and Q Two.

The findings presented in Tables Q 58 #1, #2, #4, #7 and #8 were analyzed further by assigning values of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 points to the attitudes in descending order from very favorable to very unfavorable. The findings of this analysis, based on the point values, are presented in Table Q 58 #9.

Table Q 58 #9. Mean Ratings of Responses from Various Populations for Perceived Attitudes Toward Career in Nursing of Three Classes of General Public

Classes of General Public	Q One Total Population N = 525 Mean Points	Q One Generic N = 449 Mean Points	Q One Reg. Nse N = 76 Mean Points	Q Two Total N = 241 Mean Points	Q Two Generic N = 213 Mean Points	Q Two Reg. Nse N = 28 Mean Points	Q One Sample 1 year N = 93 Mean Points	Q Two 7 year N = 93 Mean Points
Upper Class	3.28	3.32	2.93	3.33	3.37	3.00	3.16	3.25
Middle Class	4.17	4.17	4.16	4.22	4.23	4.10	4.15	4.16
Lower Class	4.38	4.43	4.28	4.44	4.44	4.46	4.50	4.48

The findings concerning respondents perceptions of attitudes of the three socio–economic classes of the public about a career in nursing indicated that

the overall pattern of these perceptions was consistent; respondents perceived that the lower class had the most positive attitude toward a career in nursing, the upper class had the least positive attitude and the attitude of the middle class fell in between;

changes in perceptions from Q One to Q Two for the total respondent population were slight but they were in a positive direction toward more favorable attitudes; perceptions of upper class attitudes were all toward more positive attitudes; for the lower and middle classes the trend was less consistent but it was, overall, in a positive direction; the one exception was the perception recorded on Q Two for middle class attitudes by the 28 registered nurse program respondents;

the lowest (least favorable) ratings were consistently perceived to be those of the upper class regardless of the nature of the population sample; the single lowest rating was attributed to the upper class by registered nurse program respondents on Q One, while the single highest rating attributed to the upper class was recorded by the generic program respondents on Q Two;

the greatest degree of consistency from one sample to another was found in the ratings given the perceptions of the middle class with a range of from 4.10 recorded by registered nurse program respondents on Q Two to 4.23 recorded by generic program respondents on Q Two;

the greatest discrepancy in ratings from one sample to another was found in the ratings given the perceptions of the upper class attitudes with a range from 2.93 recorded by the registered nurse program respondents on Q One to 3.37 recorded by generic program respondents on Q Two;

at no time and for no population sample did the highest rating attributed to the upper class reach the lowest rating attributed to the middle class, nor did the highest rating attributed to the middle class reach the lowest level attributed to the lower class;

on the basis of the relative consistency of the ratings the writers suggested that the ratings reflect the actual attitudes of the general public toward a career in nursing, most accurately by the middle class ratings, less accurately by the lower class ratings and least accurately by the upper class ratings; when the respondents recorded their perceptions of upper class attitudes they rated them as being much less favorable than the attitudes of people in the middle and lower classes; however, over time, respondents perceived attitudes toward a career in nursing as becoming more favorable on the part of the upper as well as the middle and lower classes.

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

Question 24: "What do you consider the most important nursing position you have ever held? (Place code number of position here from list in Question 20)."

There were 462 responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 24 #1.

Table Q 24 #1. Percent of Responses for Position Rated Most Important

Position Rated as Most Important	Responses N	Responses %
Ståff or general duty nurse	189	40.9
Nursing instructor or assistant	101	21.9
Head nurse or assistant	65	14.1
Supervisor nurse or assistant	33	7.1
Other	31	6.7
Nursing administrator or assistant	15	3.2
Clinical specialist	14	3.0
Nursing education administrator or assistant	12	2.6
Nursing consultant	2	0.4
Total	462	99.9

When respondents checked the "other" option they were asked to identify the title of the position they considered to have been most important. The following positions were identified.

8 recorded pediatric nurse associate;
2 recorded each of clinical instructor, research nurse, inservice instructor, family nurse clinician;
1 recorded each of assistant to surgeon with private patients, flight nurse, army health nurse, supervisor of health occupations education, nurse anesthetist, physician's office nurse, team leader, school nurse, charge nurse, nurse practitioner at St. Jude Hospital, family planning nurse, nursing consultant and head nurse (combined), director of children and youth project, chairman of teaching department at hospital school of nursing, staff nurse and nursing instructor (combined).

A comparison was made between the responses to *Question 20, *Question 23 Part 3 and Question 24. The findings are recorded in Table Q 24 #2

Table Q 24 #2. Percent of Responses for Positions Held for One Year or more. Currently Held and Most Important

Type of Position	Question 20 Held 1 year or more		Question 23–3 Currently held		Question 24 Considered most important	
	Responses N	Responses %	Responses N	Responses %	Responses N	Responses %
Staff or general duty nurse	398	46.6	147	44.3	189	40.9
Head nurse or assistant	126	14.8	30	9.0	65	14.1
Supervisor nurse or assistant	66	7.7	22	6.6	33	7.1
Nursing administrator or assistant	24	2.8	11	3.3	15	3.2
Nursing consultant	6	0.7	2	0.6	2	0.4
Nursing instructor	150	17.6	67	20.2	101	21.9
Nursing education administrator or assistant	21	2.5	9	2.7	12	2.6
Clinical specialist	9	1.1	8	2.4	14	3.0
Other	54	6.3	36	10.8	31	6.7
Total	854	100.1	332	99.9	462	99.9

In three of the options that were offered, the proportion of current employment and selection as most important are both greater than the original percent of responses identifying having been employed a year or more in the position, namely nursing administrator or assistant, nursing instructor or assistant, and "other."

The fact that more respondents identified the position of clinical specialist as the most important they had ever held, than had identified having held such a position for a year or more, may be due to the fact that some of them may have held the position for less than a year. Question 24 did not set any time limit on the duration of employment in the position to be identified as the most important ever held.

---

*Detailed consideration is given to responses to Questions 20 and 23 part 3 in Chapter 4, Volume 1.

In interpreting the findings presented in Table Q 24 #2, the writers made the assumption that the importance of a nursing position, in the view of the respondent, could be determined as follows: an important position was one for which the proportion of respondents rating it as important was greater than the proportion identifying it as a position for a year or more and/or as a position held at the time of answering the questionnaire. On the basis of this criterion it was evident that

the positions ranking highest in importance in the opinion of respondents were instructor or assistant and clinical specialist.

Question 24 was not repeated on Q Two.

A comparison was made of responses to Question 24 by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 24 #3.

Table Q 24 #3. Percent of Responses for Most Important Position by Respondents' UTCN Program

Most Important Nursing Position	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Staff or general duty nurse	189	40.9	181	45.6	8	12.3
Head nurse or assistant	65	14.1	61	15.6	4	6.2
Supervisor nurse or assistant	33	7.1	26	6.5	7	10.8
Nursing administrator or assistant	15	3.2	8	2.0	7	10.8
Nursing consultant	2	0.4	2	0.5	0	0
Nursing instructor or assistant	101	21.9	75	18.9	26	40.0
Nursing education administrator or assistant	12	2.6	6	1.5	6	9.2
Clinical specialist	14	3.0	12	3.0	2	3.1
Other	31	6.7	26	6.5	5	7.7
Total	462	99.9	397	100.1	65	100.1

The findings in Table Q 24 #3 should be considered in light of the fact that the high rating given to the importance of the staff or general duty nurse position by generic program as compared to registered nurse program respondents is influenced by the fact that approximately 50% of the generic program respondents, answering only two years after graduation, had had no other type of position. The registered nurse program respondents, however, had, in many cases, moved beyond the staff nurse position before entering UTCN and did not return to it after graduation with the baccalaureate degree.

CAREER SATISFACTIONS/DISSATISFACTIONS

Question 30: "In addition to the income received from employment, other reasons are frequently given for being employed. Please rank all the following reasons for your present employment in order of importance to you. Place a "1" by the most important, a "2" by the second most important, etc."

In Table Q 30 #1 the number and percent of responses for each option are recorded by ranks, first through sixth.

Table Q 30 #1. Reasons (Non–financial) for Present Employment Ranked for Importance

Reasons for Employment	Total Responses Number	Percent	Rank in Importance					
			First		Second		Third	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Career commitment	318	16.1	36	11.3	45	14.2	55	17.3
Job satisfaction	353	17.9	74	21.0	94	26.6	96	27.2
The people I meet	327	16.6	9	2.8	28	8.6	37	11.3
Services to others	349	17.7	62	17.8	103	29.5	89	25.5
Personal fulfillment	356	18.0	171	48.0	90	25.3	57	16.0
Scholarship or Traineeship Commitment	270	13.7	10	3.7	2	0.7	9	3.3
Total	1973	100.0	362	AV 18.3	362	AV 18.3	343	AV 17.4

Reasons for Employment	Total Responses Number	Percent	Rank in Importance					
			Fourth		Fifth		Sixth	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Career commitment	318	16.1	57	17.9	112	35.2	13	4.1
Job satisfaction	353	17.9	62	17.6	23	6.5	4	1.1
The people I meet	327	16.6	117	35.8	122	37.3	14	4.3
Services to others	349	17.7	58	16.6	33	9.5	4	1.1
Personal fulfillment	356	18.0	30	8.4	8	2.2	0	0
Scholarship or Traineeship Commitment	270	13.7	4	1.5	14	5.2	231	85.6
Total	1973	100.0	328	AV 16.6	312	AV 15.8	266	AV 13.5

A common base for comparing responses to Question 30 was developed by assigning values from 1 through 6 points to the rank of importance. First place was given a value of six points, second place a value of five points and so on down to sixth place which was given a value of one point.

The total points, percent of aggregate points and mean rank derived from each of the six options are presented in Table Q 30 #2.

Table Q 30 #2. Ranking of Reasons for Present Employment by Various Point Systems

Reasons given for being presently employed in nursing	Total Points	Percent of Aggregate Points	Mean Point Ranking
Personal fulfillment	1810	25.0	5.08
Job satisfaction	1534	21.2	4.35
Service to others	1487	20.6	4.26
Career commitment	1069	14.8	3.36
People I meet	951	13.2	2.90
Scholarship or traineeship commitment	377	5.2	1.39
Total	7228	100.0	

The percent of the aggregate score that is derived from each of the six options, by Class and by respondents' UTCN program is presented in Table A 6 Appendix.

Question 30 was not repeated on Q Two.

The findings presented for Question 30 indicated that

the three most frequently given reasons for being employed, beyond the monetary one, were found to be personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others in descending order of magnitude of ratings; this finding was consistent, no matter how the data were analyzed;

the ranking of the relative importance of the options is the same for respondents of the generic and registered nurse program groups;

the relative magnitude of the score of each of the three top choices, for the two program groups and for each option, is quite similar. (See Table A 6 Appendix)

A comparison was made of responses to a similar question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The findings in the Vanderbilt study were reported in terms of only the first choices as follows: The first choices recorded were for "service to others", "personal fulfillment" and "job satisfaction," each of which were selected by 25 percent. The remaining 25% of first choices were distributed among the other choices.

The findings presented in this comparison indicated that

respondents in the two studies provided relatively similar rankings; UTCN respondents ranked personal fulfillment as the most important, while rating service to others and job satisfaction as only slightly less important; the same three reasons for being employed were held to be the major ones in both studies.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. pg. 35

FEELINGS ABOUT NOT BEING EMPLOYED IN NURSING

Question 41 asked respondents who had indicated that they were not presently employed in nursing to identify the way they felt about it from among five options. They were asked to circle only one response.

There were 149 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 41 #1.

Table Q 41 #1. Percent of Responses for Feelings About not Being Employed in Nursing

Feelings About not Being Presently Employed in Nursing	Responses N	%
I wish I could be	69	46.3
I regret that I am not	31	20.8
I have no desire to be	23	15.4
I never think about it	16	10.7
I feel glad that I am not	10	6.7
Total	149	99.9

A comparison was made of the responses to an identical question that was answered by respondents in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The findings are presented in Table Q 41 #2.

Table Q 41 #2. Percent Response for Feelings About Not Being Employed in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents

Feelings About not Being Employed at Present in Nursing	Vanderbilt Responses N	%	UTCN Responses N	%
"I wish I could be," "I regret that I am not"	170	53.0	100	67.0
"I have no desire to be," "I am glad I am not"	108	26.0	33	22.0
"I never think about it"	54	17.0	16	11.0
Total	332	96.0	149	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 41 #2 indicated that

respondents in the UTCN study expressed a somewhat more positive feeling about their desire to be employed in nursing than did the respondents in the Vanderbilt study.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p36

A comparison was made of the responses from two graduation–response interval groups of respondents. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 41 #3.

Table Q 41 #3. Percent of Responses for Feelings About not Being Employed in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Graduation –Response Interval in Years	Regret I am not Responses N	%	Wish I could be Responses N	%	Feel glad I am not Responses N	%	No desire to be Responses N	%	Never think about it Responses N	%
3–13	23	20.4	54	47.8	3	2.7	18	15.9	15	13.3
2	8	22.2	15	41.7	7	19.4	5	13.9	1	2.8

No comparison was made between the responses recorded by the generic and registered nurse program respondents because of the small number (N=12) of the latter who were not employed when they answered Q One.

Question 41 was not repeated on Q Two.

The findings presented for Question 41 indicated that

positive feelings about being employed in nursing expressed in the two responses, "I regret that I am not" employed in nursing and "I wish I could be," outweigh negative and neutral feelings 2 to 1;

the proportion of respondents expressing these positive feelings was very similar regardless of the length of the graduation–response interval; the same was true of the proportion expressing the negative feeling, "No desire to be employed" in the two graduation–response interval groups;

there was a considerable difference, however, in the proportion of responses for "I feel glad I am not" employed and "Never think about it"; as would be expected, respondents who answered 3 to 13 years after graduation were less likely to have given thought to the fact that they were not employed in nursing than were those just 2 years out of school; a greater proportion of the more recent graduates, compared to those out of school for 3 to 13 years, indicated "I feel glad I am not" employed at present in nursing; this suggests an alternate significant commitment such as one to raising a family (see findings for Question 40, Chapter 5, Non–Employment, Volume 1);

when the responses for the neutral option, "Never think about it", are eliminated from the findings for both groups, the proportion of responses expressing a positive feeling about employment in nursing is considerably greater among respondents 3 to 13 years out of school who were not presently employed than it was among those 2 years out of school and not employed.

Question 42: "Have any of the following made you feel "uncomfortable" for not being active in nursing?" (Circle one)

There were 157 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 42 #1.

Table Q 42 #1. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing

Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing	Response N	Response %
Never felt "uncomfortable"	85	54.1
My own personal feelings	54	34.4
Other nurses who were employed	12	7.6
People outside the profession	4	2.5
Classmates	2	1.3
College of Nursing alumnae	0	0.0
College of Nursing faculty	0	0.0
Total	157	99.9

A comparison was made between these responses and those recorded for a similar question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The findings for this comparison are presented in Table Q 42 #2.

Table Q 42 #2. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing by Vanderbilt and UTCN Respondents

Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable About Not Being Active in Nursing	Vanderbilt Response N = 324 %	UTCN Responses N = 57 %
I never felt "uncomfortable"	74	54
My own personal feelings	22	34
All other reasons	4	12
Total	100	100

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p 36

The findings of this comparison indicated that

in general, the feelings of the respondents from the two universities were similar in the way the responses were distributed;

the UTCN respondents recorded more feelings of being "uncomfortable" because they were not employed in nursing, and for a greater variety of reasons, than did the Vanderbilt respondents.

A comparison was made of the responses from two graduation–response interval groups of respondents. The findings from this comparison are presented in Table Q 42 #3.

Table Q 42 #3. Percent of Responses for Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Reasons for Feeling "Uncomfortable" About not Being Active in Nursing	Graduation–Response Intervals 3–13 years Responses N	%	2 years Responses N	%
Never felt uncomfortable	67	56.3	18	47.4
My personal feelings	36	30.3	18	47.4
Other nurses who are employed	11	9.2	1	2.6
People outside the profession	3	2.5	1	2.6
Classmates	2	1.7	0	0.0
UTCN faculty	0	0.0	0	0.0
UTCN alumnae	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	119	100.0	38	100.0

No comparison was made between the responses recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents because of the small number (N=14) of the latter who were not employed.

Question 42 was not repeated on Q Two.

The findings presented in Tables Q 42 #1 and # 3 indicated that

the more recently graduated respondents recorded a higher level of feeling uncomfortable about not being employed than did respondents who were out of school longer;

however, respondents 3–13 years out of school experienced discomfort more frequently than did those in the 2 year group, as a result of their perception of the opinions of other nurses who were employed concerning the fact that they, themselves, were not employed;

the principal cause of discomfort in this regard, for those in the 2 year group, was their personal feelings about what was right for them.

Question 59: "How attractive does work in nursing today seem to you, compared with work in other fields? (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 59 #1.

Table Q 59 #1. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Responses N	%
More attractive	185	35.2
About the same	137	26.2
Less attractive	97	18.5
Much more attractive	87	16.6
Much less attractive	19	3.6
Total	525	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses recorded by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 59 #2.

Table Q 59 #2. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared with Other Fields	Total Population Responses N	%	Graduates Classes 1954–1964 Responses N	%	Graduates Classes 1965–1974 Responses N	%
Much less attractive	19	3.6	8	3.3	11	3.9
Less attractive	97	18.5	43	17.7	54	19.1
About the same	137	26.2	77	31.7	60	21.3
More attractive	185	35.2	86	35.4	99	35.1
Much more attractive	87	16.6	29	11.9	58	20.6
Total	525	100.0	243	100.0	282	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses recorded by respondents in the generic and registered nurse program groups. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 59 #3.

Table Q 59 #3. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Much less attractive	19	3.6	18	4.0	1	1.3
Less attractive	97	18.5	81	18.0	16	21.3
About the same	137	26.1	119	26.4	18	24.0
More attractive	185	35.2	157	34.9	28	37.3
Much more attractive	87	16.6	75	16.7	12	16.0
Total	525	100.0	450	100.0	75	99.9

Question 59 was repeated unchanged on Q Two. There were 242 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 59 #4.

Table Q 59 #4. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q Two

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Responses N	%
Much less attractive	6	2.5
Less attractive	37	15.3
About the same	71	29.3
More attractive	90	37.2
Much more attractive	38	15.7
Total	242	100.0

A comparison was made between the responses to Question 59 Q One and Question 28 Q Two. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 59 #5.

Table Q 59 #5. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields Q One and Q Two

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared with other fields	Q One N = 525 Responses %	Q Two N = 242 Responses %
Much less attractive	3.6	2.5
Less attractive	18.5	15.3
About the same	26.2	29.3
More attractive	35.2	37.2
Much more attractive	16.6	15.7
Total	100.1	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 28 Q Two by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 59 #6

Table Q 59 #6. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing compared to Other Fields by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Much less attractive	6	2.5	6	2.8	0	0.0
Less attractive	37	15.3	33	15.5	4	13.8
About the same	71	29.3	63	29.6	8	27.6
More attractive	90	37.2	81	38.0	9	31.0
Much more attractive	38	15.7	30	14.1	8	27.6
Total	242	100.0	213	100.0	29	100.0

Responses recorded by respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample for Question 59 Q One and Question 28 Q Two are presented in Table Q 59 #7.

Table Q 59 #7. Percent of Responses for Attractiveness of Nursing Compared to Other Fields for Two–Year Seven Year Samples

Attractiveness of Nursing Compared with Other Fields	Questionnaire One Responses N	Questionnaire One Responses %	Questionnaire Two Responses N	Questionnaire Two Responses %
Much less attractive	1	1.1	3	3.3
Less attractive	30	32.3	21	22.8
About the same	21	22.6	24	26.1
More attractive	30	32.3	34	37.0
Much more attractive	11	11.8	10	10.9
Total	93	100.1	92	100.1

The findings presented in Tables Q 59 #1 through #7 indicated that

the pattern of responses for the total population did not vary by more than 3 percentage points between Q One and Q Two category responses;

the same was the case for responses of the generic and registered nurse program respondents on Q One;

the pattern of responses for the total population, by two graduation–response intervals was similar with two exceptions; 10% more of the responses were recorded for "much more attractive" by respondents who answered 2 years after graduation, while the reverse was true in the case of the option "about the same;" two factors that may have influenced these attitudes are: conditions existing in nursing and other fields may have been different in 1967 when the 3–13 year respondents answered and in the period 1968–1976 when the 2 year group answered and the longer period of time since graduation in which to accumulate experience may have influenced attitudes;

evidence of another difference in feelings about the attractiveness of nursing emerged when responses from generic and registered nurse program groups on Q Two were compared; a considerably higher proportion of responses for the "much more attractive" option was recorded by the registered nurse program respondents than by the generic program respondents;

overall, there seemed to be a tendency toward more positive feelings about the attractivness of nursing, compared to other fields, related to the recency of graduation and the shorter graduation–response interval

RECONSIDERATION OF CAREER CHOICE

Question 60: "Knowing what you know now, do you think you would choose a career in nursing if you had to make the choice again? (Circle one)."

There were 527 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 60 #1.

Table Q 60 #1. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Responses N	%
Definitely no	13	2.5
Probably no	76	14.4
Probably yes	192	36.4
Definitely yes	246	46.7
Total	527	100.0

The findings in the Vanderbilt[1] study on this subject were similar, namely, "81% of 676 respondents stated they definitely would or probably would choose nursing as a career again, given the opportunity."

A comparison was made of the responses made by respondents who graduated in 1964 and before and those who graduated in 1965 and after. The findings are presented in Table Q 60 #2.

Table Q 60 #2. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Total Population Responses		Graduates Classes 1954–1964 Responses		Graduates Classes 1965–1974 Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Definitely no	13	2.5	7	2.9	6	2.1
Probably no	76	14.4	33	13.5	43	15.2
Probably yes	192	36.4	90	36.9	102	36.0
Definitely yes	246	46.7	114	46.7	132	46.6
Total	527	100.0	244	100.0	283	99.9

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p 48

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 60 that were made by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #3.

Table Q 60 #3. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
Definitely no	13	2.5	9	2.0	4	5.3
Probably no	76	14.4	65	14.4	11	14.5
Probably yes	192	36.4	164	36.4	28	36.8
Definitely yes	246	46.7	213	47.2	33	43.4
Total	527	100.0	451	100.0	76	100.0

Question 60 was repeated unchanged as Question 29 on Q Two. There were 244 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 60 #4.

Table Q 60 #4. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career, Q Two

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Responses N	%
Definitely no	3	1.2
Probably no	35	14.3
Probably yes	98	40.2
Definitely yes	108	44.3
Total	244	100.0

A comparison was made between the responses to Question 60 Q One and Question 29 Q Two. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #5.

Table Q 60 #5. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again as Career by Q One and Q Two

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Q One N = 527 Responses %	Q Two N = 244 Responses %
Definitely no	2.5	1.2
Probably no	14.4	14.3
Probably yes	36.4	40.2
Definitely yes	46.7	44.3
Total	100.0	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 29 Q Two recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #6.

Table Q 60 #6. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again by Respondents' UTCN Program. Q Two

Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again	Total Population Responses		Generic Graduates Responses		Registered Nurse Graduates Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Definitely no	3	1.2	3	1.4	0	0.0
Probably no	35	14.3	29	13.5	6	20.7
Probably yes	98	40.2	88	40.9	10	34.5
Definitely yes	108	44.3	95	44.2	13	44.8
Total	244	100.0	215	100.0	29	100.0

The respondents in the Two Year–Seven Year Sample are included in the total population and no additional, meaningful findings were obtained from the analysis of their responses.

The findings presented in Tables Q 60 #1 through #6 indicated that

regardless of the way in which the responses were analyzed, the likelihood of respondents thinking that they would choose nursing again on the basis of present knowledge, was consistently 80% or better; it was noted that the lowest percents for likelihood were obtained from the smaller samples;

the 17% of the 527 respondents in the total population who would probably and/or definitely not choose nursing again, suggested a level of dissatisfaction and/or disillusionment that, the writers believe, should be addressed; although it may reflect a situation that is no worse than that in other professions, it still represents a significant factor in the cost benefit relationships of nursing education; the existance of this group has been considered and measures to reduce its numbers have been proposed in Reality Shock by Marlene Kramer.

Question 30 Q Two does not have a counterpart on Q One. It was addressed to those respondents who indicated that, knowing what they presently knew, they either definitely or probably would not choose a career in nursing again.

Question 30 Q Two: "What general field of work would you choose now, if you had it to do again? (Circle one)."

There were 42* usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 60 #7.

Table Q 60 #7. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choice Q Two

Alternate Career Choice	Responses N	Responses %
Teaching	6	14.3
Business office	3	7.1
Social work	5	11.9
Medicine	9	21.4
Laboratory work	2	4.8
Other	17	40.5
Total	42	100.0

Respondents who indicated that their alternate career choice was in a field other than the five options listed, were asked to specify the field they preferred.

3 each identified art, including antiques and home economics, including interior design;
2 each identified occupational and/or physical therapy, psychology and linguistics and interpreting;
1 each identified veterinary medicine, dental hygeine, medical research, mathematics and pharmacy.

---

*This number exceeds the 38 respondents to Question 29 on Q Two to whom it was addressed. It appears that 4 respondents who answered Q Two, N= 244, but did not answer Question 29, did answer Question 30.

A comparison was made of the responses to Question 30 Q Two by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 60 #8.

Table Q 60 #8. Percent of Responses for Alternate Career Choices by Respondents' UTCN Program Q Two

Alternate Career Choices	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching	6	14.3	5	13.9	1	16.7
Business Office	3	7.1	3	8.3	0	0.0
Social Work	5	11.9	5	13.9	0	0.0
Medicine	9	21.4	7	19.4	2	33.3
Laboratory Work	2	4.8	2	5.6	0	0.0
Other	17	40.5	14	38.9	3	50.0
Total	42	100.0	36	100.0	6	100.0

The findings presented in Tables Q 60 #7 and #8 and the listing of the responses to the "other" option indicated that

the majority of those respondents who felt they would have chosen a career other than nursing were, nevertheless, attracted to personal service fields.

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

Question 54: "How would you describe your husband's attitude toward your employment as a nurse? (Circle one)."

There were 314 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 54 #1.

Table Q 54 #1. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse

Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse	Responses N	%
Strongly favors it	114	36.3
Approves it	132	42.0
Is indifferent to it	19	6.1
Discourages it	36	11.5
Opposes it	13	4.1
Total	314	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses of those who answered 3–13 years after graduation and those who answered 2 years after graduation. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 54 #2.

Table Q 54 #2. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Graduation Response Interval in years	Husband's Attitude Toward Respondents Employment as a Nurse					
	Strongly favors it Responses		Approves it Responses		Indifferent to it Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
3–13 N = 161	35	21.7	72	44.7	13	8.1
2 N = 153	79	51.6	60	39.2	6	3.9

Graduation Response Interval in years	Husband's Attitude Toward Respondents Employment as a Nurse			
	Discourages it Responses		Opposes it Responses	
	N	%	N	%
3–13 N = 161	28	17.4	13	8.1
2 N = 153	8	5.2	0	0.0

A comparison was made of the responses of the generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 54 #3.

Table Q 54 #3. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondents' Employment as a Nurse by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Attitude of Husband Toward Respondents Employment as a Nurse	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly favors it	114	36.3	103	37.1	11	30.6
Approves it	132	42.0	114	41.0	18	50.0
Is indifferent to it	19	6.1	16	5.8	3	8.3
Discourages it	36	11.5	34	12.2	2	5.6
Opposes it	13	4.1	11	4.0	2	5.6
Total	314	100.0	278	100.1	36	100.1

The same question concerning the husband's attitude was repeated on Q Two but it was directed only to those respondents who had married or remarried in the five year period since they answered Q One.

They were 22 usable responses from this group and they are presented in Table Q 54 #4.

Table Q 54 #4. Percent of Responses for Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse, for Respondents Married or Remarried Since Q One

Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse	Responses N	%
Strongly favors it	8	36.4
Approves it	12	54.5
Is indifferent to it	0	0.0
Discourages it	2	9.1
Opposes it	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0

Question 25 on Q Two does not have a counterpart on Q One. It was addressed to those respondents who were married on Q Two and whose marital status was the same as it was when they answered Q One. These respondents were asked to answer "yes" or "no" to

Question 25: "Do you feel that your husband's attitude toward your employment in nursing has changed since you answered the previous questionnaire? (Circle one)."

There were 172 usable responses. 28, 16.3% were "yes" 144, 83.7% were "no".

Question 26 on Q Two does not have a counterpart on Q One. It asked the 28 respondents who answered "yes" to Question 25 to identify the nature of the change in the attitude of the husband. The 28 responses are presented in Table Q 54 #5.

Tables Q 54 #5. Percent of Responses for Type of Change in Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as Nurse Since Q One

Change in Attitude of Husband Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse	Responses N	%
From favorable to unfavorable	11	39.3
From unfavorable to favorable	9	32.1
From indifferent to favorable	6	21.4
From indifferent to unfavorable	2	7.1
Total	28	99.9

The findings presented in Tables Q 54 #1 through #5 indicated that

respondents in the total married population and those in both subgroups on the basis of program reported close to a 4 to 1 ratio for favorable attitudes on the part of the husband toward the respondent's employment as a nurse;

in the total population, for respondents 2 years out of school, the favorable ratio was 9 to 1;

for the small group (N=28) who reported a change in attitude on the part of husbands during the interval between Q One and Q Two, a slightly higher proportion, 53.5% reported that the change was from indifferent and unfavorable to favorable than reported that the change was from indifferent and favorable to unfavorable attitudes;

the longer the graduation–response interval, the greater the likelihood of an unfavorable attitude on the part of the husband.

The writers postulated that the previously established four year break point in employment rate (see Question 12, Chapter 3, Volume 1.) and the increase in unfavorable attitudes on the part of husbands occurring between 2 and 7 years after graduation, were related.

LASTING FRIENDSHIPS AMONG RESPONDENTS

Question 56: "How many students, who attended The University of Tennessee Nursing program(s) when you did, do you count as among your friends in terms of keeping in touch with them? (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 56 #1.

Table Q 56 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are Now Friends

Number of Fellow Students Counted as Friends	Responses N	Responses %
Eight or more	90	17.1
Three	76	14.5
Four	73	13.9
Five	73	13.9
Two	68	13.0
Six	47	9.0
One	43	8.2
None	29	5.5
Seven	26	5.0
Total	525	100.1

A comparison was made of the responses of generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 56 #2.

Table Q 56 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Fellow Students who are now Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program

Member of Former Fellow Students Counted Among Friends	Total Population Responses N	Total Population Responses %	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
One	43	8.2	31	6.9	12	16.0
Two	68	13.0	59	13.1	9	12.0
Three	76	14.5	62	13.8	14	18.7
Four	73	13.9	59	13.1	14	18.7
Five	73	13.9	65	14.4	8	10.7
Six	47	9.0	42	9.3	5	6.7
Seven	26	5.0	25	5.6	1	1.3
Eight or more	90	17.1	87	19.3	3	4.0
None	29	5.5	20	4.5	9	12.0
Total	525	100.1	450	100.0	75	100.1

The responses to Question 56 were analyzed further to determine the mean number of friends reported per respondent. The findings of this analysis are presented in Table Q 56 #3.

Table Q 56 #3. Mean Number of Fellow Students Counted as Friends by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class

Class	Generic Program		Registered Nurse Program	
	Respond–ents N	Mean Number of Reported Friends	Respond–ents N	Mean Number of Reported Friends
1954	20	5.2	3	2.7
1955	16	6.7	3	7.3
1956	31	6.3	1	1.0
1957	23	6.3	4	3.0
1958	26	5.5	8	3.8
1959	17	4.9	3	4.3
1960	18	6.2	2	1.5
1961	17	5.2	4	4.3
1962	21	5.8	1	5.0
1963	6	4.2	1	1.0
1964	15	3.3	5	5.0
1965	15	5.5	4	4.5
1966	22	6.1	6	3.7
1967	12	5.7	0	0.0
1968	34	5.3	3	4.7
1969	26	6.4	4	6.0
1970	35	4.8	1	4.0
1971	24	3.7	8	4.4
1972	19	5.8	3	3.7
1973	20	4.9	3	3.3
1974	33	5.7	8	3.6
Total	450	AV5.5	75	AV4.1

The findings for responses to Question 56 indicated that

respondents in the generic program group averaged between four and five (range from two to six) of their fellow students counted as friends at the time they answered Q One; there was no significant difference in the number for those who responded 3–13 years after graduation (mean 5.6) and those who responded 2 years after graduation (mean 5.4);

respondents in the registered nurse program group averaged three of their fellow students (range from none to six) counted as friends at the time they answered Q One; there was no significant difference in the number for those who responded 3–13 years after graduation (mean 3.9) and those who responded 2 years after graduation (mean 4.2); the comparatively small number of registered nurse program respondents in each Class may have had bearing on these findings; it would imply that these respondents may have made friends among the members of their own small group rather than among members of the generic program group as well.

In the opinion of the writers, the estimated average number of classmates, 4.28, who were counted as friends would appear to be relatively high considering mobility, marriage and length of the graduation–responses interval. However, it appeared to give credence to the traditional wisdom among nurses that relatively numerous and long–lasting friendships are established among students during the time they are living, studying and working together in schools of nursing.

CHAPTER 4

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

The subjects of professional and community activities of respondents are addressed next in this study.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Question 61: "Have you ever been a member of the American Nurses' Association? (Circle one)."

There were 532 usable responses and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 61 #1.

Table Q 61 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options

ANA Membership Status	Responses N	%
Yes, currently	203	38.2
Yes, not currently	174	32.7
No	155	29.1
Total	532	100.0

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for ANA membership status by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 61 #2.

Table Q 61 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

ANA Membership Status	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
A member currently	203	38.2	154	33.8	49	64.5
A member at one time, not currently	174	32.7	154	33.8	20	26.3
Never a member	155	29.1	148	32.5	7	9.2
Total	532	100.0	456	100.1	76	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses to similar questions in the Vanderbilt [1] and NLN[2] studies and those in the UTCN study.

The Vanderbilt study reported 22% of 715 respondents (including all programs) were currently members of ANA when they provided the information in 1963. The UTCN finding of 38.2% (Table Q 61 #1) compares favorably with this Vanderbilt finding.

The NLN study reported 26.8% of 1650 baccalaureate graduates were members of ANA when they were questioned five years after graduation. The UTCN findings of 24.4% of the 213 generic program respondents who answered Q One 3-13 years after graduation and 28.6% for the 21 generic program respondents in the Class of 1962 who answered Q One five years after graduation (Table A 7, Appendix) are similar to the NLN study findings.

The findings derived from responses to Question 61 indicated that

an equal proportion of the generic program respondents had never been members, had at one time been members and were currently members of ANA when they answered Q One;

these proportions varied, however, when the graduation-response interval was taken into consideration; approximately half of the generic program respondents, 3-13 years out of school, reported having been members of ANA at one time while the remaining half were equally divided between those who had never been members and those who were currently members; less than one fifth of those responding after 2 years out of school reported having been members of ANA at one time and the remaining four fifths were divided almost equally between those who were currently members and those who had never been members;

when the responses for current and previous membership in ANA were compared with those for no membership, the ratio for the generic program respondents as a whole was 2 to 1; for the 3-13 year group it was 3 to 1; for the 2 year group it was 1.5 to 1;

registered nurse program respondents recorded a considerably higher ratio of members to non-members in ANA than did the generic program respondents; the ratio was 9 to 1 for the group as a whole, 9.3 to 0.3 for the 3-13 year group and 8.5 to 1.5 for the 2 year group;

this higher level of membership in ANA among registered nurse program respondents was interpreted as another indication of professional behavior (see their pursuit of graduate education, Chapter 2, Volume 1) that was more evident among them than among generic program respondents.

The percent of responses for 3 ANA membership options, by respondents' UTCN program, by 2 graudation-response intervals and by Class is presented in Table A 7 Appendix.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p.44

[2] Knopf, L., RN's One and Five Years After Graduation Table 35, p. 35

Question 62: "Which of the following best describes the greatest degree of you participation in the American Nurses' Association on the local, state and national level? (Circle one in each column)."

There were 362 responses recorded for participation at the local, state and national levels. It was apparent that not all the 377 respondents, who recorded in Question 61 that they had been members at some time, responded to Question 62. The responses are presented in Table Q 62 #1.

Table Q 62 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation.

Degrees of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	38	10.5	14	3.9	2	0.6
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	81	22.4	41	11.3	8	2.2
Minimal: pay dues occasionally attend meetings	243	67.1	307	84.8	352	97.2
Total	362	100.0	362	100.0	362	100.0

A comparison was made of the responses of the generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of the comparison are presented in Table Q 62 #2.

Table Q 62 #2. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and by Respondents' UTCN Program.

	Generic Program Respondents					
Degrees of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	25	8.5	7	2.4	2	0.7
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	59	20.1	25	8;5	3	1.0
Minimal: pay dues occasionally attend meetings	209	71.3	261	89.1	288	98.3
Total	293	99.9	293	100.0	293	100.0

	Registered Nurse Program Respondents					
Degrees of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	13	18.8	7	10.1	0	0
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	22	31.9	16	23.2	5	7.2
Minimal: pay dues occasionally attend meetings	34	49.3	46	66.7	64	92.8
Total	69	100.0	69	100.0	69	100.0

The responses for Question 62 were further analyzed by assigning values to the degrees of participation ranging from 3 points for leadership participation responses down to 1 point for minimal participation responses. The findings of this analysis, based on the point system, by respondents' UTCN Program and by Class, are presented in Tables A 8 and A 9 Appendix.

A summary of the findings in Tables A 8 and A 9 is presented in Summary Table Q 62 #3.

Summary Table Q 62 #3. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation, by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals.

			Local Association					
Generic Program	N	Pts	Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	293	402	75	18.7	118	29.4	209	52.0
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	152	227	60	26.4	70	30.8	97	42.7
G – R Interval 2 years	141	175	15	8.6	48	27.4	112	64.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	69	117	39	33.3	44	37.6	34	29.1
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	34	70	36	51.4	24	34.3	10	14.3
G – R Interval 2 years	35	47	3	6.4	20	42.6	24	51.1

Summary Table Q 62 #3 continued.

			State Association					
Generic Program	N	Pts	Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	293	332	21	6.3	50	15.1	261	78.9
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	152	183	15	8.2	34	18.6	130	71.1
G – R Interval 2 years	141	153	6	3.9	16	10.5	131	85.6
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	69	99	21	21.2	32	32.3	46	46.5
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	34	57	18	31.6	22	38.6	17	29.8
G – R Interval 2 years	35	42	3	7.1	10	23.8	29	69.0

Summary Table Q 62 #3 continued.

Generic Program	N	Pts	National Association Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	293	300	3	2.0	6	2.0	289	96.0
G–R Interval 3 – 13 years	152	157	3	1.9	6	3.8	148	94.3
G–R Interval 2 years	141	141	0	0.0	6	0.0	141	100.0

Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	69	74	0	0.0	10	14.5	64	86.5
G–R Interval 3 – 13 years	34	38	0	0.0	8	21.1	30	78.9
G–R Interval 2 years	35	36	0	0.0	2	5.6	34	94.4

The findings in Table Q 62 #2 and Summary Table Q 62 #3 indicated that

in addition to reporting a higher rate of membership, the registered nurse program respondents reported a higher degree of participation in ANA activities than did generic program respondents;

as was to be expected, at local, state and national levels of the organization, the longer the graduation-response interval, the greater was the degree of participation as leaders and active members by respondents in both programs.

The findings of the Vanderbilt[1] study on the subject of the degree of participation in ANA could not be compared meaningfully with the UTCN findings because of differences in categories of participation and method of reporting.

Question 62 was not repeated on Q Two. However it was possible to tabulate some information concerning activity of respondents in the American Nurses' Association during the five year period covered in Q Two from responses to Question 31, Q Two.

Question 31 asked respondents to "List the elective offices and committee positions you have held in professional organizations for the period of time covered in this questionnaire."

There were 31 responses that were identified as related to the local level of ANA, 13 that were related to the state level and 1 response was related to the national level of ANA. These were distributed between the two degrees of participation, leadership participation and active participation. The wording of Question 31 ruled out responses at the minimal level since it asked only for elected offices and appointed committee positions. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table Q 62 #4.

Table Q 62 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two.

Degree of Participation	Local Assoc. Responses		State Assoc. Responses		National Assoc. Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer committee chairman	21	67.7	7	53.8	1	100
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	10	32.3	6	46.2	0	0.0
Total	31	100.0	13	100.0	1	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 62 #4 indicated that

the participation rate, beyond minimal membership, of this group, 18.1% of 249 respondents to Q Two, was noticeably less than that for the total population on Q One, 34.5% of 533 respondents; since the writers have already made the point that the Q Two population was a representative sample of the Q One population, the most parsimonious interpretation of this finding was that there was a proportional decrease in active and leadership participation in ANA with the passage of time.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 46

Question 63: "Have you ever been a member of the National League for Nursing (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they were distributed as presented in Table Q 63 #1.

Table Q 63 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options.

NLN Membership Status	Responses N	%
Yes, currently	50	9.5
Yes, not currently	80	15.2
No	395	75.2
Total	525	99.9

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for NLN membership status by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 63 #2.

Table Q 63 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program.

NLN Membership Status	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
A member currently	50	9.5	28	6.2	22	29.3
A member at one time, not currently	80	15.2	64	14.2	16	21.3
Never a member	395	75.2	358	79.6	37	49.3
Total	525	99.9	450	100.0	75	99.9

A comparison was made of responses in the Vanderbilt[1] and the NLN[2] study with those in the UTCN study.

The Vanderbilt study reported 18% of 715 respondents (including all programs) were currently members of the NLN when they provided the information in 1963. The UTCN finding of 9.5% (Table Q 63 #1) does not compare favorably with the Vanderbilt finding.

The NLN study reported 3.2% of 1650 baccalaureate graduates were members of NLN when they were questioned five years after graduation. The UTCN findings of 12.0% of 208 generic program respondents who answered Q One from 3-13 years after graduation and 14.3% of the 21 generic program respondents in the Class of 1962 who answered Q One five years after graduation (Table A 10 Appendix) compare favorably with the NLN study findings.

The percent of responses for 3 NLN membership options, by the respondents' UTCN program, by 2 graduation-response intervals and by Class is presented in Table A 10 Appendix.

The findings derived from responses to Question 63 indicated that

a considerably higher proportion of generic program respondents had never been members of NLN than was the case for registered nurse program respondents;

registered nurse program respondents showed higher proportions of responses for current membership among both the 3-13 and the 2 year graduation-response interval groups than did the generic program respondents;

the longer graduation-response interval was related positively to increased NLN membership in both program groups. The writers believed that the rate of membership in the NLN is higher among nurses employed in nursing education than among those otherwise employed and they postulated that there was a positive relationship between these NLN membership findings and findings recorded for Question 18, Q One concerning employers reported 3-13 years after graduation (Table Q 18 #4, Chapter 4, Volume 1).

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 44

[2] Knopf, L., RNs One and Five Years After Graduation Table 35 p. 35.

Question 64: "Which of the following best describes the greatest degree of your participation in the National League for Nursing? (Circle one number in each column)."

There were 126 responses for participation at the local, state and national levels of NLN. It was apparent that almost but not all the 130 respondents who answered in Question 63 that they had been members at one time, responded to Question 64. The responses are presented in Table Q 64 #1.

Table Q 64 #1. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation.

Degrees of Participation	Local League Responses		State League Responses		National League Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer, committee chairman	19	15.0	11	8.7	1	0.8
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	26	20.6	20	15.9	5	4.0
Minimal: pary dues occasionally attend	81	64.3	95	75.4	120	95.2
Total	126	99.9	126	100.0	126	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 64 #1 indicated that

82 respondents, 15.4% of the total N of respondents to Q One, indicated that their degree of participation in NLN was above the minimal.

A comparison was made of responses indicating the degree of participation in NLN recorded by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 64 #2.

Table Q 64 #2 Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 3 Degrees of Participation and Respondents' UTCN Program.

	Generic Program					
Degree of Participation	Local League Responses		State League Responses		National League Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer, committee chairman	7	7.9	5	5.6	1	1.1
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	17	19.1	9	10.1	2	2.2
Minimal: pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	65	73.0	75	84.3	86	96.6
Total	89	100.0	89	100.0	89	99.9

	Registered Nurse Program					
Degree of Participation	Local League Responses		State League Responses		National League Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership: officer, committee chairman	12	32.4	6	16.2	0	0
Active: attend meetings, serve on committees	9	24.3	11	29.7	3	8.1
Minimal: pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	16	43.2	20	54.1	34	91.9
Total	37	99.9	37	100.0	37	100.0

The findings for Question 64 were analyzed further by assigning values to the degrees of participation ranging from 3 points for leadership participation responses down to 1 point for minimal participation responses. The findings of this analysis, based on the point system, by respondents' UTCN program and by Class are presented in Tables A11 and A12 Appendix.

A summary of the findings presented in Tables A11 and A12 is presented in Summary Table Q 64 #3.

Summary Table Q 64 #3. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Level by 3 Degrees of Participation, by Respondents' UTCN Program and by 2 Graduation-Response Intervals.

			Local League					
Generic Program	N	Pts	Leadership (3 points) Score	%	Active (2 points) Score	%	Minimal (1 point) Score	%
Total	89	120	21	17.5	34	28.3	65	54.2
G – R Interval 3 - 13 Years	70	100	21	21.0	32	32.0	47	47.0
G – R Interval 2 years	19	20	0	0.0	2	10.0	18	90.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	37	70	36	51.4	18	25.7	16	22.9
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	26	58	36	62.1	16	27.6	6	10.3
G – R Interval 2 years	11	12	0	0.0	2	16.7	10	83.3

Summary Table Q 64 #3 continued.

			State League					
			Leadership (3 points)		Active (2 points)		Minimal (1 point)	
Generic Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	89	108	15	13.9	18	16.7	75	69.4
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	70	89	15	16.9	18	20.2	56	62.9
G – R Interval 2 years	19	19	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	100.0
Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	37	60	18	30.0	22	36.7	20	33.3
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	26	49	18	36.7	22	44.9	9	18.4
G – R Interval 2 years	11	11	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	100.0

Summary Table Q 64 #3 continued.

			National League					
			Leadership (3 points)		Active (2 points)		Minimal (1 point)	
Generic Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	89	93	3	3.2	4	4.3	86	92.5
G – R Interval 3 - 13 years	70	74	3	41	4	5.4	67	94.4
G – R Interval 2 years	19	19	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	100.0

Registered Nurse Program	N	Pts	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Total	37	40	0	0.0	6	15.0	34	85.0
G – R Interval 3 - 13 Years	26	29	0	0.0	6	20.7	23	79.3
G - R Interval 2 years	11	11	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	100.0

The findings in Table Q 64 #3 indicated that

the same pattern of degrees of participation that was evident in relation to membership in ANA was evident again in the NLN findings;

the registered nurse program respondents were active to a greater degree proportionately and, again, they were more active in the local and state leagues; this was true, in particular, for the registered nurse program respondents in the 3-13 year graudation-response interval group.

Unfortunately the findings of the Vanderbilt[1] study on the subject of the degree of participation in NLN could not be compared with the UTCN findings because of differences in categories of participation and method of reporting.

Question 64 was not repeated on Questionnaire Two. Please see the discussion of Question 62 for the description of the use of appropriate responses recorded for Question 31 Q Two.

There were 7 responses that were identified as related to the local league, 7 responses related to the state league and 1 response related to the National League for Nursing. These were distributed between two degrees of participation, leadership participation and active participation, due to the wording of Question 31 Q Two. The distribution of these responses is presented in Table Q 64 #4.

Table Q 64 #4. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at Local, State and National Levels by 2 Degrees of Participation Q Two.

Degree of Participation	Local League Responses N	Local League Responses %	State League Responses N	State League Responses %	National League Responses N	National League Responses %
Leadership: officer committee chairman	4	57.1	4	57.1	0	0.0
Active: attend meetings serve on committees	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	100.0
Total	7	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0

The findings presented in Table Q 64 #4 indicated that

the participation rate, beyond minimal membership, of this small group (6.0%) of the 249 respondents to Q Two, was noticeably less than that for the total population of Q One (15.4%) of 533 respondents; the pattern here was similar to that of ANA participation.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 46

Question 65: "Have you ever been a member of any professional organization(s) other than the American Nurses' Assoication and the National League for Nursing? example: National Education Assoication, American Hosptial Association, American Public Health Association. (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in descending order of frequency in Table Q 65 #1.

Table Q 65 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Membership in Other Professional Organizations.

Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations	Responses #	%
No, none	406	77.3
Yes, one	85	16.2
Yes, two	27	5.1
Yes, three	5	1.0
Yes, four or more	2	0.4
Total	525	100.0

The five respondents who recorded that they were members of three additional professional organizations were found, one each, in the Classes that graduated in 1955, 1956, 1958, 1969 and 1974. The latter two were registered nurse program respondents.

The two respondents who recorded that they were members of four or more additional professional organizations were found, one each, in the Classes of 1956 and 1959.

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for number of memberships in other professional organizations by respondents' UTCN program. The findings are presented in Table Q 65 #2.

Table Q 65 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Memberships in Other Professional Organizations	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
One	85	16.2	70	15.5	15	20.3
Two	27	5.1	18	4.0	9	12.2
Three	5	1.0	3	0.7	2	2.7
Four or more	2	0.4	0	0.0	2	2.7
None	406	77.3	360	79.8	46	62.2
Total	525	100.0	451	100.0	74	100.1

The findings presented in Table Q 65 #2 indicated that

the proportion of the registered nurse program respondents that reported membership in other professional organizations was higher by 15 percentage points than that reported by generic program respondents.

The percent of responses for the two options, membership in one and membership in two other professional organizations were combined and they are presented, by Class in Table Q 65 #3.

Table Q 65 #3. Percent of Responses for One and Two Memberships in Other Professional Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation-Response Intervals and by Class.

		Generic Program			Registered Nurse Program		
Class	G–R Int. years	Respondents	Responses		Respondents	Responses	
		N	N	%	N	N	%
1954	13	20	1	5.0	3	2	66.7
1955	12	17	3	17.6	3	1	33.3
1956	11	31	11	35.5	1	0	0.0
1957	10	23	5	21.7	3	2	66.7
1958	9	27	6	22.2	8	5	62.5
1959	8	17	4	23.5	3	1	33.3
1960	7	18	2	11.1	2	2	100.0
1961	6	17	2	11.8	4	4	100.0
1962	5	21	6	28.6	1	0	0.0
1963	4	5	1	20.0	1	0	0.0
1964	3	13	1	7.7	5	0	0.0
1965	2	16	3	18.8	4	1	25.0
1966	2	22	3	13.6	6	0	0.0
1967	2	12	3	25.0	0	0	0.0
1968	2	34	4	11.7	3	0	0.0
1969	2	26	4	15.4	5	0	0.0
1970	2	36	9	25.0	1	0	0.0
1971	2	24	8	33.3	8	1	12.5
1972	2	19	4	21.1	3	3	100.0
1973	2	21	3	14.3	2	1	50.0
1974	2	32	5	15.6	8	1	12.5
		451	88	mean 19.0 of percents	74	24	mean 31.5 of percents
Graduation–Response Intervals							
3 - 13 years		309	42	mean 18.6 of percent		17	mean 42.0 of percent
2 years		242	46	mean 19.3 of percent		7	mean 21.0 of percent

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for a similar question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The N on which the Vanderbilt findings were based was 693 and the stipulation was that the membership was current at the time of reporting. The findings were reported as follows; "Additional professional membership were reported by 28 percent (197) of the respondents, 59 percent (117) of these reported one membership."

The findings were compared with UTCN findings that 22.7 percent (119) of the respondents reported additional memberships and 71.4 percent (85) of these reported only one additional membership.

The conclusion drawn was that

UTCN respondents, although they reported on memberships over the total graduation-response interval, were less likely to have been members of professional organizations other than ANA and NLN and that the number of these organizations in which they had held memberships was fewer for them than for Vanderbilt respondents.

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for a similar question in the NLN[2] study. The UTCN finding of 20.2% (91) of the 451 generic program respondents reporting membership in one to three other professional organizations compared favorably with the NLN finding of 11.9%. The UTCN finding of 28.6% (9) of the generic program respondents in the Class of 1962 who answered Q One five years after graduation is based on so small a sample that it is not representative of even the 3-13 year graduation-response interval group on this subject.

Question 66: "Which of the following activities best exemplifies the greatest degree of your participation in the groups listed in Question 65? (Circle one)."

There were 123 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 66 #1.

Table Q 66 #1. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations.

Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations	Responses N	%
Leadership participation, e.g. officer, committee chairman	11	8.9
Active participation, e.g. attend meetings, serve on committees	28	22.7
Minimal participation, e.g. pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	84	68.3
Total	123	99.9

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 46

[2] Knopf, L. Table 35 p. 35

A comparison was made of the responses indicating degree of participation by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 66 #2.

Table Q 66 #2. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Degrees of Participation in Other Professional Organizations	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leadership participation	11	8.9	7	7.4	4	14.3
Active participation	28	22.7	20	21.0	8	28.6
Minimal participation	84	68.3	68	71.6	16	57.1
Total	123	99.9	95	100.0	28	100.0

Question 66 was not repeated on Q Two. However, it was possible to identify some professional organizations other than ANA and NLN in which respondents had held membership during the five year period since they answered Q One by the responses they made to Question 31 on Q Two. Question 31 aksed respondents to "List the elective offices and committee positions you have held in professional organizations for the period of time covered in this questionnaire."

The findings were as follows: 3 respondents reported membership in the American Public Health Association; 2 reported membership in the School Nurses' Association and 1 reported membership in the Association of Nurse Anesthetists.

The findings presented in Table Q 66 #1 and #2 indicated that

the degree of participation in professional organizations other than ANA and NLN that respondents reported in Table Q 66 #1 closely resembled the degree of participation reported in Table Q 62 #1 for the total population in the local level of ANA;

again, registered nurse program respondents were active to a greater degree, proportionately, in the other professional organizations than were the generic program respondents.

A comparison as made of the degree of participation in other professional organizations reported in the UTCN and Vanderbilt[1] studies. The percent of responses for membership in other professional organizations was 28.4% for Vanderbilt and 23.1% for UTCN for the total population. The degree of participation of the 197 Vanderbilt respondents who reported membership in other professional organizations was reported as follows: "Sixty-four percent (125) of the 197 described their participation as active and leadership in nature."

Of the 123 UTCN respondents who recorded being members of other professional organizations, 31.7% (39) indicated that their participation fell in the leadership and active categories.

The conclusion drawn was that

UTCN respondents actively partipated to a lesser degree than did Vanderbilt respondents in professional organizations other than ANA and NLN.

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Question 68: "In how many voluntary health and welfare organizations do you currently participate? e.g. Cancer Society, Heart Association, hospital board, Mental Health Assoication, etc. (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 68 #1.

Table Q 68 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations	Responses N	%
One	93	17.5
Two	44	8.3
Three	11	2.1
Four or more	6	1.1
None	377	71.0
Total	531	100.0

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 46

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses indicating the number of voluntary health and welfare organizations respondents participated in by generic and registered nurse program. The findings are presented in Table Q 68 #2.

Table Q 68 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations	Total Population Responses		Generic Program Responses		Registered Nurse Program Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	93	17.5	79	17.4	14	18.4
Two	44	8.3	32	7.0	12	15.8
Three	11	2.1	9	2.0	2	2.6
Four and more	6	1.1	4	0.9	2	2.6
None	377	71.0	331	72.7	46	60.2
Total	531	100.0	455	100.0	76	99.9

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for an identical question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The N on which the findings were based was 693 and the stipulation was that the membership was current at the time of reporting. The findings were reported as follows: "Fifty-one percent (362) of the respondents reported current participation in voluntary health and welfare organizations. Twenty-seven percent (190) of the sample participated in two or more of this type of organization."

The Vanderbilt findings indicated a higher rate of participation than did the UTCN findings; twenty-nine percent (154) of the respondents reported current membership in voluntary health and welfare organizations and thirty-nine percent (61) of these respondents were members of two or more organizations of this type.

In the NLN[2] study an open ended question, addressed to respondents 5 years after graduation asked; "What activities related to the health field have you been engaged in during the past year?" The findings were that twenty-nine percent (482) baccalaureate program respondents had participated. This is comparable to the twenty-seven percent (124) of the UTCN generic program respondents reporting membership in one or more of these organizations. (Table Q 68 #2)

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L. p. 46

[2] Knopf, L. RNs Five Years After Graudation Table 36 p. 35

Question 68 was not repeated on Questionnaire Two. However, it was possible to tabulate some information concerning participation by respondents in voluntary health and welfare organizations, during the five year period since they answered Q One, from responses to Question 31 Q Two. Question 31 asked respondents to "List the elective offices and committee positions you have held in professional organizations for the time covered in this questionnaire." In addition to the information recorded about participation in professional organizations which has been reported in the discussions of Questions 62, 64 and 66, responses to Question 31 also included reports of participation in voluntary health and welfare organizations including those given as examples in Question 68.

The voluntary health and welfare organizations that were identified and the number of respondents who reported participating in each during this five year interval are as follows:

Number of Responses	Name of Organizations
1	American Cancer Society
2	American Heart Association
1	Mental Health Association
4	American Red Cross
1	County Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependency.
1	Tennessee Nurses' Association and Allied Groups and Government Relations Council.
1	South Central Comprehensive Health Planning Council
1	Committee on Health Manpower, Memphis and Midsouth Council for Comprehensive Health Planning.
1	Speech and Hearing Center
2	State or County Home Health Agency
1	Regional Health Education Center
1	Suicide Prevention Program
2	Regional Council on Nursing
1	Sheltered Workshop
1	Regional Center for the Healing Arts

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Question 69: "In how many other voluntary organizations, such as religious, political, civic or educational groups, etc., do you currently participate? (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 69 #1.

Table Q 69 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations	Responses N	%
One	171	32.2
Two	112	21.1
Three	45	8.5
Four or more	18	3.4
None	185	34.8
Total	531	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses for the number of memberships in voluntary community organizations by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 69 #2.

Table Q 69 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations, by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations	Total Population Responses N	%	Generic Program Responses N	%	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	%
One	171	32.2	147	32.3	24	31.6
Two	112	21.1	93	20.4	19	25.0
Three	45	8.5	38	8.4	7	9.2
Four and more	18	3.4	17	3.7	1	1.3
None	185	34.8	160	35.2	25	32.9
Total	531	100.0	455	100.0	76	100.0

The UTCN findings were compared with the findings for an identical question in the Vanderbilt[1] study. The N on which the findings were based was 639 and the stipulation was that the membership was current at the time of reporting. The findings were reported as follows: ". . . . 80 percent (567) currently participated in one or more voluntary organizations such as religious, political, civic or educational groups. Fifty-six percent (400) belonged to two or more."

These findings were compared with the UTCN findings that 65.2% (345) of respondents reported current participation in voluntary community organizations and 50.7% (175) of these respondents participated in two or more organizations.

These findings were not as disparate with the Vanderbilt findings as were the findings concerning participation in voluntary health and welfare organizations in the two studies (Question 68). Both Vanderbilt and UTCN respondents were more likely to participate in non-health related voluntary community organizations than in health related ones. This finding held for single as well as multiple memberships.

Question 69 was not repeated on Questionnaire Two. However, it was possible to tabulate some information concerning participation of respondents in voluntary community organizations during the five year period since they answered Q One from responses made to Question 31 Q Two. In addition to information recorded about participation in professional organizations and voluntary health and welfare organizations, responses to Question 31 also included information about participation in groups that can be described as voluntary community organizations.

The voluntary community organizations that were identified and the number of respondents that identified participation in them are as follows:

Number of Responses	Name of Organization
1	Association for Childhood Education
1	American Society of Training and Development
1	Reelfoot Rural Ministry.

Activities that respondents reported in response to Question 31 Q Two that did not fall into any of the categories dealt with in Questions 61 through 69 are presented here:

2	respondents reported that they had served on the Tennessee Board of Nursing
1	had served on the Committee of Deans and Directors of Schools of Nursing in Tennessee
11	has served as officers of the University of Tennessee Alumni Association and
1	had served on the Board of Directors of the University of Tennessee General Alumni Association and the Committee on Women's Activities of the General Alumni Association
4	had served on officers of the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 48

NURSING JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

Question 70: "To how many nursing journals do you presently subscribe as an individual? Examples: American Journal of Nursing, Nursing Outlook, Nursing Science, Nursing Forum, Nursing Research, Nursing World, R.N., International Nursing Review, etc. (Circle one)."

There were 531 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 70 #1.

Table Q 70 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions.

Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions	Responses N	Responses %
One	206	38.8
Two	86	16.2
Three or more	35	6.6
None	204	38.4
Total	531	100.0

A comparison was made of the number and percent of responses for the number of nursing journal subscriptions by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 70 #2.

Table Q 70 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of Nursing Journals Subscriptions	Total Population Responses N	Total Population Responses %	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
One	206	38.8	183	40.1	23	30.7
Two	86	16.2	60	13.2	26	34.7
Three or more	35	6.6	23	5.0	12	16.0
None	204	38.4	190	41.7	14	18.7
Total	531	100.0	456	100.0	75	100.1

A comparison was made of the percent of responses for one subscription and two and more subscriptions to nursing journals by generic and registered nurse program respondents and by Class. The findings of this comparison are presented in Table Q 70 #3.

Table Q 70 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class.

		Generic Program				
	Grad. Resp.		Number of Journals			
	Int.	Respondents	One		Two or more	
Class	years	N	N	%	N	%
1954	13	20	6	30.0	2	20.0
1955	12	17	5	29.4	2	11.8
1956	11	32	6	18.8	7	21.9
1957	10	23	7	30.4	2	8.7
1958	9	27	5	18.5	6	22.2
1959	8	17	8	47.1	1	5.9
1960	7	18	7	38.9	1	5.6
1961	6	17	4	23.5	2	11.8
1962	5	21	7	33.3	6	28.6
1963	4	6	1	16.7	0	0.0
1964	3	15	9	60.0	2	13.3
1965	2	16	9	56.3	3	18.8
1966	2	22	13	59.1	3	13.6
1967	2	12	6	50.0	1	8.3
1968	2	34	20	58.8	4	11.8
1969	2	26	13	50.0	3	11.5
1970	2	36	15	41.7	8	22.2
1971	2	24	5	20.8	14	3.4
1972	2	19	11	57.9	4	14.5
1973	2	21	12	57.1	2	9.5
1974	2	33	14	42.4	8	24.2
		* 456	183	Av 40.1	83	Av 18.2
Average for 3 - 13 years				Av 30.5		Av 15.5
Average for 2 years				Av 48.6		Av 20.6

*190 respondents 41.7%
subscribed to none

Table Q 70 #3. Percent of Responses for Number of Nursing Journal Subscriptions by Respondents'
(continued) UTCN Program and by Class.

Registered Nurse Program

Class	Respondents N	Number of Journals One N	%	Two or more N	%
1954	3	1	33.3	1	33.3
1955	3	0	0.0	1	33.3
1956	1	0	0.0	1	33.3
1957	4	0	0.0	2	50.0
1958	7	2	28.6	4	57.1
1959	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1960	2	0	0.0	1	50.0
1961	4	2	50.0	2	50.0
1962	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
1963	1	0	0.0	1	100.0
1964	5	3	60.0	2	40.0
1965	4	1	25.0	3	75.0
1966	6	3	50.0	1	16.7
1967	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	3	3	100.0	0	0.0
1969	5	2	40.0	1	20.0
1970	1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1971	8	2	25.0	5	62.5
1972	3	0	0.0	3	100.0
1973	3	1	33.3	2	66.7
1974	8	1	12.5	6	75.0
	*75	23	Av 30.7	38	Av 50.7
Average for 3 - 13 years			Av 29.4		Av 50.0
Average for 2 years			Av 31.7		Av 51.0

*14 respondents 18.7%
subscribed to none

The findings presented in Table Q 70 #3 indicated that

registered nurse program respondents subscribed to a greater number of nursing journals (1.5 per respondent) than did generic program respondents (0.8 per respondent) and this was the case regardless of differences in the graduation-response intervals; approximately 80% of the registered nurse program respondents subscribed to one or more nursing journals at the time they answered Q One;

generic program respondents reached only a 70% subscription rate among respondents answering 2 years after graduation and this rate dropped to 46% among those answering 3-13 years after graduation.

The findings for an identical question to the Vanderbilt[1] study, based on an N of 684, were reported as follows: "Fifty percent of the sample subscribe to one or more professional journals. Many comments were made on the questionnaire stating that many of the professional journals were available at the place of employment and, therefore, individual subscriptions were not necessary."

These findings compare with the UTCN finding that 61.6% of respondents reported having current subscriptions to one or more nursing journals.

---

[1] Donaldson, M.L., p. 48

CHAPTER 5

HONORS AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

The subject of honors, awards and professional achievement of respondents is addressed in this chapter.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Question 67: "Are you currently a member of any honorary societies? (Circle one)."

There were 525 usable responses and they are presented in Table Q 67 #1.

Table Q 67 #1. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships.

Number of Honorary Society Memberships	Responses N	Responses %
One	69	13.1
Two	7	1.3
Three	0	0.0
Four or more	0	0.0
None	449	85.5
Total	525	99.9

When these findings are compared with the write in responses to Part 3 of Question 71 (Chapter 5 Volume 2) it is justified to assume that 16 respondents who reported being members of at least one honorary society in Table Q 67 #1 were members of honorary societies other than Sigma Theta Tau since only sixty respondents answered positively to this item in Question 71.

The seven respondents who recorded that they held membership in two honorary socieites were found, one each, in the Classes that graduated in 1958 and 1971, two in the Class that graduated in 1964 and three in the Class that graduated in 1972.

A comparison was made of the responses made by generic and registered nurse program respondents. The findings are presented in Table Q 67 #2.

Table Q 67 #2. Percent of Responses for Number of Honorary Society Memberships by Respondents' UTCN Program.

Number of honor societies in which membership is held	Total Population Responses N	Total Population Responses %	Generic Program Responses N	Generic Program Responses %	Registered Nurse Program Responses N	Registered Nurse Program Responses %
One	69	13.1	56	12.4	13	17.3
Two	7	1.3	3	0.7	4	5.3
Three	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Four or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
None	449	85.5	391	86.9	58	77.3
Total	525	99.9	450	100.0	75	99.9

The percent of responses for membership in one, two and no honorary societies, by respondents' UTCN program, by 2 graduation–response intervals and by Class is presented in Table Q 67 #3.

Table Q 67 #3. Percent of Responses for Membership in One, Two and No Honorary Societies by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals by Class.

		Generic Program						
	G–R Interval	Respondents	One Society		Two Societies		None	
Class	Years	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	13	20	2	10.0	0	0.0	18	90.0
1955	12	17	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	100.0
1956	11	32	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	100.0
1957	10	23	1	4.3	0	0.0	22	95.7
1958	9	26	2	7.7	0	0.0	24	92.3
1959	8	17	1	5.9	0	0.0	16	94.1
1960	7	18	1	5.6	0	0.0	17	94.4
1961	6	17	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	100.0
1962	5	21	2	9.5	0	0.0	19	90.5
1963	4	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0
1964	3	14	2	14.3	0	0.0	12	85.7
1965	2	16	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	100.0
1966	2	22	2	9.1	0	0.0	20	90.9
1967	2	12	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7
1968	2	33	1	3.0	0	0.0	32	97.0
1969	2	25	3	12.0	0	0.0	22	88.0
1970	2	36	9	25.0	0	0.0	27	75.0
1971	2	24	8	33.3	1	4.2	15	62.5
1972	2	19	6	31.6	2	10.5	11	57.9
1973	2	21	5	23.8	0	0.0	16	76.2
1974	2	32	9	28.1	0	0.0	23	71.9
Total		450	56	12.0 mean	3	1.4 mean	391	87.8 mean
Graduation–Response Intervals 3–13 years			mean of percent	7.0		0.0		93.0
2 years			mean of percent	17.4		1.4		81.1

Table Q 67 #3 continued.

		Registered Nurse Program					
	Respondents	One Society		Two Societies		None	
Class	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
1955	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
1956	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1957	4	2	50.0	0	0.0	2	50.0
1958	8	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0
1959	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
1960	2	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
1961	4	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0
1962	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1963	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1964	5	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0
1965	4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
1966	6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
1967	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
1969	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0
1970	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1971	8	4	50.0	0	0.0	4	50.0
1972	3	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
1973	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
1974	8	2	25.0	0	0.0	6	75.0
Total	75	13	12.7 mean	4	4.1 mean	58	78.5 mean
Graduation–Response Intervals 3–13 years		mean of percent	15.5		4.8		79.7
2 years		mean of percent	9.5		3.3		77.2

The findings for Question 67 should be considered in light of the fact that the local honor society, Upsilon Tau, was instituted in the spring of 1970 and the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau, the National Honor Society of Nursing, was established in the spring of 1972 at UTCN. In 1972, graduates from the Classes 1954 through 1969 were nominated for membership.

No attempt has been made to establish comparable representativeness of the 76 respondents who reported honor society membership in Question 67 with the respondents who answered Q One and/or the respondents who were known to have been inducted into Beta Theta Chapter.

The findings presented in Tables Q 67 #2 and #3 indicated that

the increase in the rate of membership in honor socieites was directly related to the establishment of the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau at UTCN;

the proportion of registered nurse program respondents reporting membership in one or more honor societies (29.3%) was twice the proportion of generic program respondents reporting the same thing.

A comparison was made between the findings in the NLN[1] and UTCN studies concerning membership in honor societies. The NLN report stated "......146 baccalaureate degree program graduates were members of honor societies in nursing." Although it is not specifically stated in the NLN report, it was assumed by the writers, that the total N to be used in this comparison was 1650 baccalaureate degree program respondents. (See Table 35.) If this was indeed the case, 8.8% of the baccalaureate program respondents in the NLN study were members of nursing honor societies. In the UTCN study, 59 of the 450 generic program respondents, 13.1% reported being members of one or more honor societies, including honor societies in nursing.

Although the questionnaire used in the Vanderbilt study asked for information about membership in Sigma Theta Tau, no findings are included in the report.

In part One of Question 71 respondents were asked to identify honors they received while in school or later and to specify additional honors they had received that were not listed in Q One.
The honors that were listed were as follows:

The Faculty Award, conferred each year 1955 through 1974 on the graduate with the highest scholastic average in the class.

The Trustees Award, conferred each year 1955 through 1962 by the Board of the John Gaston Hospital on "the graduate who showed herself to be most mindful of the welfare of her patients."

Membership in Sigma Theta Tau, honorary society of nursing. An honorary society, Upsilon Tau, was established in the College of Nursing in 1968 as prerequisite to the establishment of a chapter of Sigma Theta Tau. The Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau was chartered at the College of Nursing in 1972.

---

[1] Knopf, L., RNs One and Five Years After Graduation, PP. 35–36.

The findings for Part One of Question 71 were as follows:

The Faculty Award was given to 20 persons during this time span. Sixteen of them, including one graduate of the Registered Nurse Program, responded to Questionnaire One and identified the fact that they received the Faculty Award. Two responded to the Questionnaire but did not answer Question 71. The remaining two recipients did not respond to the Questionnaire.

The Board of Trustees Award was given to 8 persons during this time span. Seven of them responded to Questionnaire One and identified the fact that they had received the Trustees Award. One recipient did not respond to Questionnaire One.

Sixty respondents reported that they were members of Sigma Theta Tau, including 25 graduates of the Registered Nurse Program. The distribution of these 60 members among the Beta Theta Chapter and other chapters is presented in Table Q 71 #1.

Table Q 71 #1. Distribution of Sigma Theta Tau Membership by Respondents' UTCN Program and Chapter.

	Total Membership	Generic Program	Registered Nurse Program
All Chapters	60	45	15
Beta Theta Chapter	39	34	5
Other Chapters	21	11	10

Respondents reported having received these awards and honors in addition to the ones listed in Question 71:

The Alumni Award
The Sophmore Award
Outstanding Student Nurse
Public Health Nurse of the Year 1961
Outstanding Young Women of 1966

The Alumni Award, which replaced the Trustees Award in 1965, and was conferred, thereafter, each year through 1974, recognized the graduate who had the highest grade point average in clinical nursing courses, in each Class. The Alumni Award was given to eleven persons in this time span. Eight of them, including one graduate of the Registered Nurse Program responded to Questionnaire One and identified the fact that they had received the Alumni Award. One recipient responded to Questionnaire One but did not answer Question 71. Two additional recipients did not respond to Questionnaire One.

The Sophmore Award began in 1966 as the "Class of 1965 Award." The name was changed in 1968 to the "Sophomore Award" and in 1970 to the First Year Award. Its purpose had been the same throughout – namely to recognize a student for outstanding performance in the first year of the generic program in the College of Nursing, the selection being made jointly by students and faculty.

Two respondents reported having received the Sophmore Award.

The Outstanding Student Nurse Competition was sponsored by the Tennessee Association of Student Nurses

2 respondents were named Outstanding Student Nurse of Tennessee
1 respondent was named Outstanding Student Nurse of District One T.A.S.N.
3 respondents were named to represent The University of Tennessee College of Nursing in the District Contest

In addition to the above awards

1 respondent reported being named Public Health Nurse of the Year 1961 for New Mexico
1 respondent reported being named to Who's Who in American Colleges, 1953
1 respondent reported being named to Who's Who of American Women, 1966–67
1 respondent reported being named Outstanding Young Woman in 1966 (region not specified)

Question 71 Part 1 was not repeated on Q Two. For information about honors, awards and Sigma Theta Tau membership associated with the five year period between questionnaires, see the report of findings under the heading, Significant Things Omitted from the Questionnaire, Question 38 on Q Two in Volume 2 Chapter 7.

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Respondents reported on their activities as consultants, public speakers, published authors and researchers in Parts Two through Four of Question 71, Q One.

CONSULTATIONS

Question 71 Part Two asked respondents to: "List your consultant type activities, giving organization and area."

There were 28 respondents who reported acting as consultant, including 20 graduates of the generic program and 8 graduates of the registered nurse program. Three of the graduates of the generic program held the masters degree, while six of the registered nurse program graduates held the masters degree when they reported being consultants.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #2

Table Q 71 #2. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q One.

Subject in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization seeking Consultation	Number
Nursing as a Career	2	Girl Scout Troops	2
	2	Future Nurse Clubs	2
Nursing, General	1	County Title I Advisory	1
		Committee	1
Nursing Education;			
Accreditation by NLN	1	Hospital School of Nursing	1
Curriculum Development	1	Hosptial School of Nursing	1
Nursing Service Administration;			
Nurse Professional Standards	1	VA Hosptial Nursing Staff	1
Nursing Service Admininstration	1	Community Hosptial	1
Team Nursing, Implementation and Follow-up	1	ANA Local District	1
Clinical Nursing:			
Rehabilitation	1	Insurance Company	1
Care of Children during Disaster	1	Public Health Department Personnel	1
Coronary Care Nursing	1	Community Hosptial	1
Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation	1	Nursing Education Committee of Heart Assoc.	1
Pediatric Nursing	1	Community Hospital Nursing Staff	1
Public Health Nursing	1	Association for Retarded Children	1
Infection Surveillance	1	Community Hospital Staff	2

Table Q 71 #2. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q One. (continued)

Subject in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization seeking Consultation	Number
Role of Family Nurse Clinician	1	Collegiate Nursing Program Faculty	2
Education of Expectant Parent	1	Am. Red Cross Chapter	1
Nursing Care of Newborn	1	Regional Medical Program Staff	1
Maternity Nursing	1	La Leche League	1
Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing	1	Urban Hosptial Staff	1
Poisoning and Emergency Medicine	1	Poison Center	1
		Community College	1
Care of spinal cord injured patient	1	VA Hosptial – Staff in Medical–surg & psychiatric units	1
Aging and Nutrition	1	Regional Development Center for Government Training – Professionals working with the Elderly	1
Retardation Nursing	3	Retardation Services Staff	1
		HEW Research Project Staff	1
		Halfway House for Retarded Adults Staff	1
Total number of Consultations	28	Total number of Organizations	31

Question 32: Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List your consultant type activities giving organization and area" for the period of time covered by this questionnaire.

There were 31 respondents who reported acting as consultants including 24 graduates of the generic program and 7 graduates of the registered nurse program.

Thirteen of the graduates of the generic program held the masters degree, one additional graduate held the doctoral degree and all eight of the graduates of the registered nurse program held the masters degree when they reported being consultants.

Thirty eight consultations were reported by the 31 respondents as follows:

19 respondents reported only 1 consultation each
7 respondents reported 2 consultations each
1 respondent reported 5 consultations
4 respondents reported the organizations for which they acted as consultants but did not identify the area of consultation.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #3 .

Table Q 71 #3. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q Two.

Subjects in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization Seeking Consultation	Number
Nursing as a Career	0		0
Nursing – General			
Nursing	4	Unihealth Service Corp. Inc.	1
		Advisory Board County H.D.	1
		Advisory Board County Health Education Board	1
		Association for Retarded Children	1
Free Health Care for Residents	1	Housing Project Clinic	1
Nursing Education			
Accreditation by NLN	1	Not specified	
Curriculum Development	1	Collegiate Program faculty	1
Curriculum Development in Rehabilitation Nursing	1	Collegiate Program Faculty	1
Program for Disadvantaged Nursing Students	1	Diploma Program Faculty	1
Planning and Coordinating Continuing Education for RNs and LPNs	2	Regional Health Council 14 counties	1
		MultiCounty Area of State Hosptial Assn.	1
Grant Writing and Continuing Application Preparation	1	Psychiatric Clinic of Regional Public Health Office	1
Nursing Theory Development	1	Faculty in Graduate Program in Nursing	1
Internatioal Nursing Clinical Specialization	1	Faculty in Collegiate School in Nursing	1
Latin Culture	1	Clinical Transplant Center	1
Nursing Care Plans	1	Community Hosptials	1
Nursing Inservice Education	2	Community Hosptials	1
		City & County Health Dept.	1
Nursing Service Administration			
Problem Oriented Medical Records System	1	V.A. Hospital Staff	1
Nursing Service Administration	1	Nursing Service Dept. Community Hospital	1
Nursing Audit and Quality Control	1	State Psychiatric Hosptial Staff	1

Table Q 71 #3. Consultations, subjects and organizations Q Two. (continued)

Subjects in which Consultation was Provided	Number	Organization Seeking Consultation	Number
Clinical Nursing			
Cardio–Pulmonary Resuscitation & Artificial Respiration	1	Rescue Squad Members Grade School Children	1 1
Public Health Nurse	1	Regional Medical Program Head Start Program Regional Committee on Aging	1 1 1
Home Follow–up	1	Clinical Research Center	1
Infection Surveillance	1	Community Hospitals	1
Maternity Care	1	City & County Health Dept.	1
Maternal and Child Health	1	Regional Public Health Service	1
Psychiatric Nursing	1	Hospital Nursing Staff	1
Psychiatric Needs	1	Hospital Head Nurses	1
Nursing the Mentally Retarded	1	Public Health Department	1
Emotional Problems	1	Clinical Research Center Staff	1
Behavior Problems in Children	1	City Public School System	1
Early Childhood Education and Development	1	Parents in 3 cooperating Preschool programs	1
The Family	1	Hospital Head Nurses	1
Family Therapy	1	Health Center	1
Suicide Prevention	1	not specified	
Effects of Disaster	1	Office of Emergency Preparedness Washington, D.C.	1
Community Planning related to Drug Use	1	not specified	
Intensive Care Nursing	1	Hospital Systems Staff	1
Breast Cancer	1	American Cancer Society	1
Uterine Task Force	1	American Cancer Society	1
Area not specified		Regional Educational Corp. Advisory Board of County Health Department City Rape and Crisis Center C.H.E.C. (no further identification)	1 1 1 1
Total number of consultations	41	Total number of organizations	45

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Two Q One and Question 38 Q Two indicated that

not only had the number of consultations reported increased from Q One to Q Two, but there had been increases in the variety and degree of sophistication of the subjects of the consultations.

PUBLIC SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

Question 71 Part Three asked respondents to: "List your public speaking activities giving subject and audience." Thirty two respondents reported public speaking activities. The 52 public speaking activities (subjects multiplied by the number of respondents who presented each subject) were reported by the 32 respondents as follows:

19 respondents reported only one subject each
8 respondents reported two subjects each
4 respondents reported three subjects each
1 respondent reported five subjects.

The 61 appearances before audiences were reported by the 32 respondents as follows:

18 respondents reported addressing one audience each
7 respondents reported addressing two audiences each
6 respondents reported addressing three audiences each
1 respondent reported addressing five audiences
1 respondent reported addressing seven audiences.

In two instances the nature of the audience was not specified.

The 32 respondents included six registered nurse program respondents.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #4

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q One.

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Nursing as a Career	6	Junior & Senior HS Students	3
		Future Nurse Clubs	2
		High School Counselors	1
Sex Education	2	9-18 year old students	1
		Teenage Church Group	1
Health Needs of Pre–School Children	1	Parent Teacher Association	1
Pilot Program for Practical Nursing in High School	1	Not specified	
Children and Safety	1	Girl Scout Group	1
Recognizing the Emotionally Disturbed Child	1	Teachers	1
Meeting the Emotional Needs of Children	2	Nursery school teacher	1
		Parent Teacher Association	1

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q One. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
The Teacher's Role in a Health Program	1	Parent Teacher Association	1
Poisoning and Emergency Medicine	1	Visiting Nurse Association	1
		Pre School Staff	1
		Community College Students	1
Nursing			
Heart Disease	1	Heart Association Forum	1
Fear of Death in Patients with Congestive Heart Disease	1	Registered and licensed practical nurses	1
Self Examination of Breast	1	College Student Wives Club	1
Student Experience in Work Study Program of American Cancer Society	1	Not specified	
Care of Colostomy Patient	1	Registered nurse Inservice Class	1
"To Smoke or Not to Smoke"	1	Student Body of a College	1
Care of Alcoholic Patient	1	ANA District members	1
Nursing in Neurological Conditions	1	Workshop for Nurses	1
Lamaze Childbirth	1	Expectant Parent Group	1
Role of the Labor Room Nurse	1	Regional Conference for Physicians and Nurses	1
Temperature Concerns of Neonatal Nurses	1	Nurses	1
Regional Transport Needs of the Newborn	1	County Medical Society	1
Care of High Risk Newborn	1	Neonatal nurses	1
Red Cross Blood Bank Program	1	Junior Auxiliary of Medical Society	1
First Aid in the Home	1	Jaycettes	1
Cardio–pulmonary Resuscitation	1	Cotillion Club	1
		Dentists and Physicians	1
Public Health			
Development of Chronic Illness Program in a Health Department	1	Public Health Nurses	1

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q one. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Services Offered by the P.H. Department	2	Parent Teachers Association	1
		Preschool Staff	1
		Home Demonstrators Club	1
Health and Preventive Measures	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
		Methodist Youth Fellowship	1
		Ladies' Club	1
		American Red Cross Chapter	1
		4H Club	1
		Girl Scout Group	1
		Boy Scout Group	1
Communicable Diseases	1	Power Co. Employees	1
Medicare and the Public Health Nurse	1	UTCN Alumni	1
Role of the Pediatric Nurse Associate in the Public Health Agency	1	Baccalaureate nursing students	1
Nursing Education			
Legal Implications of Charting	1	Registered Nurses & Licensed Practical Nurses League Workshop	1
Use of Educational Television	1	League Meeting	1
New Things Occurring in Psychiatric Nursing	1	UTCN Alumni	1
Primary Nursing	1	Nursing Inservice Educators	1
Sexual Identity	1	Inservice Class of RNs and LPNs	1
The Therapeutic Community	1	Nursing Assistants	1
Adult Education	1	Registered and Licensed Practical Nurses at League Workshop	1
"Administrators are Human"	1	Continuing Education Workshop for Nurses	1
On Nursing Education	1	Hospital Auxiliary	1
		Community College Faculty	1
Summer Student Program on Mental Deficiency at Diagnostic and Evaluation Center	1	Regional Association on Mental Deficiency	1

Table Q 71 #4. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q One. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Role of the Pediatric Nurse Associate or Practitioner	2	ANA District Meetings	2
Role of the Pediatric Nurse Associate vs. the Physician's Assistant	1	Health Educators	1
Totals	52	Total audiences	61

Question 33 Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List your professional public speaking activities giving subject and audience" for the period of time covered by this Questionnaire. Fifty respondents reported public speaking activities. The 86 public speaking activities, (the subjects multiplied by the number of respondents who presented each subject) were reported by the 51 respondents as follows:

31 respondents reported only one subject each
9 respondents reported two subjects each
9 respondents reported three subjects each
2 respondents reported five subjects each

The 100 appearances before audiences were reported by the 50 respondents as follows:

28 reported addressing one audience each
10 reported addressing two audiences each
6 reported addressing three audiences each
2 reported addressing four audiences each
3 reported addressing five audiences each
1 reported addressing seven audiences

In three instances the nature of the audience was not specified.

The fifty one respondents included eight registered nurse program respondents.

The findings are presented in Table Q 71 #5

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two.

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Nursing as a Career	5	High School Students	2
		Future Nurse Club	1
		TV audience	1
		College Students	1

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Health Careers	2	High School students	1
		High School counselors	1
Child Care and Development			
School Health	1	Parent Teacher Association	1
How Teachers Can Assist with School Health Programs	1	Teachers in Inservice Program	1
Visual Screening	1	Students in College of Education	1
General Health and Nutrition	2	Elementary school students	2
Regional Child Development Program	1	Nurses	1
		Mental Health Association	1
Sex Education and Personhood	1	Church group of teenage girls	1
Drug abuse	3	School children	1
		District Nurses' Association	1
		Not specified	
Adolescents and Families	1	Not specified	
Child Abuse	1	Community Service Volunteers	1
Early Childhood Education and Development	1	Parents of Preschool Children	1
Child Psychology	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
Human Growth and Development	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
		Pre School Association	1
Nursing			
Anesthesia	1	Staff Nurses	1
Nursing Care Process	1	Nurses	1
Medical Hypnosis	1	Nurses Organization	1
		Civic Group	1
		Nursing Students	1
Hyphosis	1	Nurse Anesthetist students	1
Changes in Nursing and Attitudes toward Nursing	1	Women's Club	1
Sudden Infant Death Syndrome	1	Public Health Nurses	1
Orientation to being a patient in Pediatric Hosptial	1	First Grade students	1
Birth Control	2	High School Students	2

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audience	Number
Maternal & Infant Care	3	Red Cross Volunteers	2
		High School Students	1
Care of Spinal Cord Injury Patients	1	Physicians and Nurses	1
Cardio–pulmonary Resuscitation	2	High School students	1
		Girl Scouts	1
		Boy Scouts	1
		Wesleyan Youth Foundation	1
Dialysis	2	Nurses	2
Nursing in Renal Failure	1	District Nurses' Association	1
		Private Duty Nurses	1
The Nurse Practitioner	1	Nurses and laypeople	1
The Lamaze Childbirth Experience	1	Collegiate Nursing Students	1
Nursing for the Stroke Patient	1	Nurses in Continuing Education	1
Nursing and Diabetes	2	Nutritionists, Nurses and Physicians	2
Intensive Care Nursing	1	Nurses and Physicians	1
Coronary Care Nursing	1	Rotary Club	1
		Civitan Club	1
		Exchange Club	1
		Women's Club	1
Sickle Cell Disease	1	High School Students	1
Chronic Illnesses of Children	1	Students in Special Education	1
Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities	1	Regional meeting of American Association of Mental Retardation	1
Day Care for the Retarded	1	Nursing Division American Association of Mental Deficiency	1
Nurse Midwifery	1	Deans in School of Public Health	1
		Nursing Students	1
Psychological Aspects of Disaster	1	Trainees in Red Cross Disaster Course	1

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audiences	Number
Transactional Analysis	1	Social Workers in Workshop	1
Interviewing Skills	1	Psychiatric Nurses in Workshop	1
Statement on Psychiatric Nursing Practice	1	Psychiatric Nurses Conference Group	1
Nurses Role in Suicide Prevention	1	District Nurses' Association	1
Death, Impact and Implications	1	Nurses of Regional Medical Program	1
Latency Age Group Therapy	1	Child Welfare Workers	1
Effects of Activity Group Therapy on Self Concept of Chronic Schizophrenic Patients	1	Nurses' Association	1
Nursing Care of Adolescent Drug Abusers	1	Nurses' Alumni Association	1
Relation of Mobility to Man's Health Status	1	Faculty and Students in Collegiate nursing program	1
Book Review of "Born to Win"	1	Psychiatric Hospital Staff	1
Women's Issues	1	Not specified	
Public Health			
Immunization	1	Expectant Mothers Group	1
What are the Duties of the School Nurse	1	Parent Teachers Association	1
The Role of the Public Health Nurse	1	Church Group Sixth Grade Students	1 1
Planned Parenthood	2	School Group Planned Parenthood Volunteers	1 1
Problems of Population Control	1	Planned Parenthood Volunteers Physicians Wives	1 1
Pre–Natal Care, Does it Make A Difference?	1	Public Health Nurses	1
Program for Unwed Mothers	1	Ob–Gyn Nurses	1

Table Q 71 #5. Public Speaking Activities Subjects and Audiences Q Two. (continued)

Subject	Number	Audiences	Number
Stress Syndrome in Intensive Care Unit and Implications for Occupational Health Nurses	1	American Public Health Association Convention	1
Nursing Education			
Remedial Programs for High Risk Students in Diploma Programs	1	A P G A Tennessee League for Nursing	2 1
Clinical Evaluation for Disadvantages Students	1	Council of Diploma Program Nurses in SREB Workshop	2 1
Issues Confronting Nurses	1	Nurses	1
Educational Programs using Ladder Concept	1	District Nurses' Association	1
Associate Degree Education in Nursing	1	State Associate Degree Faculty	1
Methods of Artriculation in Nursing Education	1	Deans, Directors of Nursing Programs	1
Nursing Theoretical Framework	1	Nurses in Clinical Sessions	1
Relation of Biological Rhythms to Nursing's Conceptual Framework	1	Nurses in Workshop	1
Teaching Research	1	ZOT Day Audience	1
Doctoral Curriculum	1	Nurses in Clinical Session	1
Nursing Service			
Leadership and Management in Nursing	1	Nursing Service Administrators	1
Anxiety, Key Concept in Nursing Management	1	Nurses' Association	1
Changing Roles of Nursing; Why the Change and What of the Future	1	National League for Nursing in Convention	1
Totals	86	Total Audiences	100

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Three Q One and Question 33 Q Two indicated that

not only had the number of professional public speaking appearances reported increased from Q One to Q Two but there had also been an increase in the variety of the topics presented.

PUBLISHING ACTIVITIES

Question 71 Part Four asked respondents to: "List exact titles and references for all professional addresses, articles, books, or research studies that you have had accepted for publication."

Six respondents reported the following:

"An Issue in Nursing" in Tomorrow's Nurse, 4:28–31 April–May, 1963.

"Identifying and Meeting Patient Needs in Short Span Nurse–Patient Relationships" in Nursing Forum, Spring 1966.

"I Like Eggs" in The American Journal of Nursing, June 1965.

A letter to the Editor, in Nursing Outlook 1974.

"Colostomy – What Now." A booklet for patients published by the Veterans' Administration.

"Shock: Pathology and Implications for Nursing Care." in Self Instructional Materials for Health Care Professionals.

One respondent among these six was a registered nurse program respondent.

Question 34, Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List exact titles and references for all professional addresses, articles, books or research studies that you have had accepted for publication."

Twelve respondents reported the following:

Publications of respondents who reported one publication each were

"Psychological Effects of Nurses in Disaster," in Nursing Research, July–August 1973.

"Nursing Care of the Child with Subacute Sclerosing Panencephalitis," in American Journal of Nursing.

"Helping the Family Cope with Subacute Sclerosing Panencephalitis," in American Journal of Nursing.

"Separation Anxiety, A Personal Look," in American Journal of Nursing.

"Nursing in a Developing Area," in Tennessee Nurses' Association Bulletin, April, 1972.

"Miss Washington – A Difficult–to–accept Patient," in Nursing, 1973.

"Changing Roles: Why the Changes? What of the Future?" Publication # 20–1503, National League for Nursing.

Publications of respondents who reported four publications each were:

"Interagency Contract: A Cooperative Effort in Community Methadone Programming." in Proceedings, 5th Annual Methadone Conference.

"Behavioral Contracts in Methadone Programs," in Proceedings, 5th Anual Methadone Conference.

"Drug Abuse Problems or Issues for the Psychiatric Nurse Practitioner," in Professional Development in Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing published by the American Nurses' Association, in 1975.

"Psychotherapeutic Intervention with the Addict Client," in Nursing Clinics of North America, September 1976.

"1966 Student Work Programs in Mental Retardation," in Public Health Reports #83 in 1968.

"Interdisciplinary Training," –Feeding the Handicapped Child, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center, 1971.

"The Validity of Interdisciplinary Training Programs: A Survey of One UAF's Trainees," – The Identification and Management of Selected Developmental Disabilities: A Guide for Nurses, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center, 1973.

"The Efficiency of Short Term Training: Workshops and Behavioral Change," – The Identification and Management of Selected Developmental Disabilities published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center, 1973.

Publications of two respondents who reported five publications each are:

"Evaluation and Prediction of Clinical Performance in a School of Nursing," published by St. Mary's Memorial Hospital School of Nursing, Knoxville, 1971.

"Second Chance," in Hospitals, Journal of the American Hospital Association, January 1972.

"How Do We Help High Risk Students?" in Nursing Outlook, February 1972.

"Three Therapeutic Models: Similarities and Differences," Monograph published in Knoxville, 1972.

"Some Objective Approaches to Evaluation." in League Exchange #86 published by the National League for Nursing.

"Time Estimation in Relation to Gait Tempo," in Perceptual and Motor Skills, Volume 34, 1972.

"Nursing's Theoretical Evaluation," in Nursing Outlook, Volume 20, 1972.

"Identifying and Meeting Patients' Needs in Short–span Nurse–patient Relationships," in The Challenge of Nursing, Margaret E. Auld and Linda Hulthen Berum, editors. Published by C.V. Mosby Co., 1973.

"Relationships of Biological Rhythms to Nursing's Conceptual System," in Proceedings of Nursing Institute on Biological Rhythms, The Catholic University of America, Washington D.C., April 1973.

"A Source Book for Nursing Research," published by F.A. Davis & Co., Philadelphia, 1973.

Publications of 1 respondent who reported six publications are:

"The Denver Developmental Screening Test in Nursing Application," a film produced by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1969.

"A Nursing Study of Day Care for Mentally Retarded Children," published by The University of Tennessee Medical Units in 1971.

"Relationship of Nursing to Nutrition," – Feeding the Handicapped Child, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1971.

"Nursing Assessment" Feeding the Handicapped Child, published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1971.

"The Identification and Management of Selected Developmental Disabilities: A Guide for Nurses," published by The University of Tennessee Child Development Center in 1973.

"Hypervalinemia: A Family's Reaction, A Nursing Challenge," in Nursing Forum.

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Four Q One and Question 34 Q Two indicated that

as might be expected, the number of publications reported has increased over time and they have been generated mainly by those in academic settings.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Question 71 Part Five asked respondents to: "List titles of all nursing research projects in which you have been one of the investigators exclusive of master's theses and doctoral dissertations."

Seven respondents reported the following studies:

A study comparing nursing salaries in larger hospitals in Indianapolis to salaries of teachers in the same area.

An asthma study connected with a College of Medicine, gathering data while visiting out–patients in their homes, 1960.

A study to develop a staff orientation schedule.

A study to promote better use of nursing care plans.

A study on team nursing.

A study to identify how to educate and train child behavior specialists.

A study of manic depressive illness; managed study subjects on in–patient ward.

A study of the effectiveness of electrical tooth brushing versus conventional brushing.

One respondent reported participating in two studies.

One respondent was a graduate of the registered nurse program.

Question 34 Questionnaire Two asked respondents to: "List the titles of all nursing research projects in which you have been one of the investigators, exclusive of masters theses and doctoral dissertations."

Four respondents reported one research project each, as follows:

A study of the evaluation of clinical practice in a diploma school of nursing.

A nursing study of day care for mentally retarded children.

A study of the use of computers in nursing.

A study of individualized education for pre and post surgical patients: the effect of instruction by initial anxiety trait.

One respondent reported two research projects as follows:

A study of the walking rate in relation to time perception.

A study of space–time relationships in older adults.

Six respondents reported one project each that was not of a strictly research design.

The subjects were as follows:

A project to develop a remedial program for high risk students in a diploma school of nursing.

A project to develop self learning and pacing modules in pediatric nursing at a collegiate school of nursing.

A state–wide study of school health nurses to determine their educational levels and their performance of functions and the importance of these functions.

An investigation of the effects of Hurricane Celia on Corpus Christi for the American Red Cross.

A project to develop an "experimental" one year practical nursing program designed to permit transfer of graduates, without loss of credit, to cooperating associate degree programs in the same state.

The Five School Consortium in Memphis, designed to identify similarities and differences among, diploma, associate degree and baccalaureate curricula with a view to proposing a core curriculum in nursing.

Two of these ten respondents were registered nurse program respondents.

The findings presented for Question 71 Part Five Q One and Question 35 Q Two indicated that

although the number of research activities reported was small overall, there has been some increase in number and sophistication of topics from Q One to Q Two responses.

CHAPTER 6

CONTINUOUS NURSING CAREERS

In this chapter, responses from respondents in the modal and non–modal groups, to some of the questions that are dealt with in Volume 2, are compared.

The modal group numbered 100 generic program respondents, each of whom was employed full–time or part–time in nursing, or was engaged in the study of nursing at the time each answered Q One and Q Two. The respondents in the modal group thus constituted a group of UTCN graduates who had been engaged in nursing activities almost continuously since graduation. They were members of the Classes of 1954 through 1969.

The non–modal group numbered 119 generic program respondents who answered both questionnaires but were not necessarily employed in nursing or studying nursing at the time they answered one or the other or both of the questionnaires. They, also, were members of the Classes of 1954 through 1969.

The remaining 105 generic program respondents from these classes who answered Q One did not respond to Q Two and were, therefore, excluded from the following comparisons.

The modal group was numerically representative of the total respondent population, by Class. The composition of the modal and non–modal groups, by Class, is presented in Tables MG #1 and #2 in Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of this report.

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

OCCUPATION OF FATHER

A comparison of the number and percent of responses from modal and non–modal respondents regarding the primary occupation of the father at the time the respondent enrolled in UTCN (Question 3 Q One) is presented in Table A13 Appendix. A summary of the findings of this comparison is presented in Table MG #1.

Summary Table MG #1. Percent of Responses for 6 Categories of Occupation of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents, by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
Occupation of Father	Total N=100 %	Classes 1954–64 N=53 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=116 %	Classes 1954–64 N-84 %	Classes 1965–69 N-32 %
Profession	13.0	7.5	19.1	20.7	15.5	34.4
Proprietor, business official	32.0	28.3	36.2	40.6	41.6	37.6
Salesman, clerical worker , technician	18.0	17.0	19.2	14.6	13.1	18.8
Farm owner, farm manager	15.0	20.8	8.5	8.6	10.7	3.1
Skilled operator, service worker	19.0	20.8	17.1	12.1	15.5	3.1
Farm worker, laborer	3.0	5.7	0.0	3.4	3.6	3.1
Total	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1

The findings presented in Summary Table MG #1 indicated that

the proportion of the respondents who reported the occupation of the father as professional, proprietor and business official and farm owner and manager was 60% for the modal group, whereas for the non–modal group it was 69.9%;

a greater difference existed between respondents in the two groups who were members of the Classes of 1965 to 1969; modal group respondents in these Classes reported 63.8% of fathers for the three above occupational categories, while non–modal respondents reported 75.1% for father for them;

a still greater difference existed between the modal and non–modal respondents in the later Classes when two occupational categories were considered, namely, professional and proprietor and business official; modal group respondents in the later Classes reported 55.3% of fathers for these two categories, whereas non–modal group respondents reported 72.0% of fathers for them;

although there was an apparent decrease in the proportion of fathers in both groups who were in the occupational category of skilled operator and service worker, in the later Classes of the modal group these fathers were still heavily represented (17.1%) while in the later Classes of the non–modal group, they were hardly represented (3.1%);

on the basis of these occupational data for fathers it was clear that the respondents in the modal group represented a lower socio–economic class than did the respondents in the non–modal group; an inference could be made here to the effect that the modal group utilized nursing as a path for upward mobility.

EMPLOYED/NOT EMPLOYED STATUS OF MOTHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal respondents regarding the employed/not employed status of the mother at the time the respondent enrolled at UTCN (Question 5 Q One) is presented in Table MG #2.

Table MG #2. Percent of Responses for Employment/Not Employed Status of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Mother's Employment Status		
Modal Group	N	Not Employed Responses %	Employed Part–Time Responses %	Employed Full–Time Responses %
Total	100	43.0	8.0	49.0
Classes 1954–64	53	47.2	9.4	43.4
Classes 1965–69	47	38.3	6.4	55.3
Non–modal Group				
Total	119	58.8	4.2	37.0
Classes 1954–64	87	58.6	4.6	36.8
Classes 1965–69	32	59.4	3.1	37.5

The findings presented in Table MG #2 indicated that

the employment rate for the mothers of modal group respondents was higher than the national average for employment of mothers;

the employment rate for the mothers of non–modal respondents was more in keeping with the rate for a random sample of mothers;

the increase in the proportion of employed mothers for respondents in the later Classes of the modal group was not present for their classmates in the non–modal group.

OCCUPATION OF MOTHER

A comparison of the number and percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the occupation of the mother (if she was employed) at the time the respondent entered UTCN (Question 6 Q One) is presented in Table MG #3.

Table MG #3. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupation of Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
	N=57	N=28	N=29	N=49	N=36	N=13
Occupation of Mother	%	%	%	%	%	%
Profession	36.8	28.6	44.8	38.8	44.4	23.1
Proprietor, business official	12.3	14.3	10.3	18.4	13.9	30.8
Saleswoman, clerical worker, technician	43.9	42.9	44.8	32.7	27.8	46.2
Skilled operator, service worker	7.1	14.3	0.0	10.2	13.9	0.0
Total	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.1

The findings presented in Table MG #3 indicated that

a greater proportion of the mothers of the non–modal group respondents worked in more highly skilled, and by inference, more highly paid, occupations than was the case for mothers of the modal group respondents;

the small N of mothers of non–modal respondents in the Classes 1965 through 1969 makes comparisons of the findings for the earlier and later Class groups more tentative; while the occupations of the modal group mothers in the earlier Classes are predominantly in the saleswoman, clerical worker category, the occupations of the modal group mothers in the later Classes shifted significantly toward the profession category; the shift in occupations of the non–modal group mothers, from earlier to later Classes was away from the profession category and toward the proprietor, business official and the saleswoman and clerical worker categories.

EDUCATION OF FATHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding levels of education completed by the father (Question 7 Q One) is presented in Table MG #4.

Table MG #4. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Father for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
Education Completed by Father	Total N=100 %	Classes 1954–64 N=53 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=119 %	Classes 1954–64 N=87 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %
Grade school	16.0	24.5	6.4	10.9	12.6	6.3
Some high school	21.0	30.2	10.6	16.8	18.4	12.5
High school graduate	18.0	17.0	19.1	22.7	24.1	18.7
Technical/vocational graduate (include RN)	5.0	3.8	6.4	5.0	3.4	9.4
Some college	14.0	13.2	14.9	20.2	21.8	15.6
College graduate	16.0	7.5	25.5	13.4	11.5	18.7
Post graduate	10.0	3.8	17.0	10.9	8.1	18.7
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9

The findings presented in Table MG #4 indicated that

overall, the average level of education completed by the fathers of the modal group respondents was slightly higher than for the fathers of the non–modal respondents;

a striking difference was evident between the level of education completed by fathers of respondents in the earlier Classes of both groups; the proportion of the fathers of the modal group respondents who had completed their education with graduation from high school or less, was 71.7% while for the fathers of non–modal group respondents it was 55.1%;

the level of education completed by fathers of respondents in the later Classes of the modal and non–modal groups was not nearly as discrepant, suggesting continued upward mobility of the families of modal group respondents.

EDUCATION OF MOTHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the level of education completed by the mother (Question 7 Q One) is presented in Table MG #5.

Table MG #5. Percent of Responses for Level of Education of Mother for Modal and Non-modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Education Completed by Mother	N=100 %	N=53 %	N=47 %	N=119 %	N=87 %	N=32 %
Grade school	6.0	11.3	0.0	6.7	8.0	3.1
Some high school	10.0	15.1	4.3	13.4	16.1	6.3
High school graduate	26.0	28.3	23.4	28.6	24.1	40.6
Technical/vocational graduate (include RN)	16.0	7.5	25.5	16.8	13.8	25.0
Some college, not graduate	22.0	22.6	21.3	20.2	23.0	12.5
College graduate	16.0	13.2	19.1	10.9	12.6	6.3
Post graduate	4.0	1.9	6.4	3.4	2.3	6.3
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1

The findings presented in Table MG #5 indicated that

overall, the average level of education completed by the mothers of modal group respondents was similar to that completed by mothers of non–modal group respondents with the important exception that, as a whole, the proportion of mothers who had graduated from college plus those who had subsequently done post graduate study was 20.0% for modal group mothers and 14.3% for non–modal group mothers;

the education completed by mothers of respondents in the earlier Classes, 1954 through 1964, in the modal and non–modal groups was also similar; it was of interest to note, however, that for the level of graduation from a technical or vocational program (including RN), the proportion for mothers of the modal group respondents was lower (7.5%) than it was for the mothers of non–modal group respondents (13.8%)

a more striking difference was evident between the level of education completed by mothers of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups in the later Classes, 1965 through 1969; in this group, 50.0% of the mothers of non–modal respondents completed their education with graduation from high school or less, while only 27.7% of mothers of modal group respondents ended their education at this level; as might be anticipated on the basis of these data, a considerably higher proportion of mothers of model group respondents in the later Classes had completed some college, had graduated from college and had completed some post graduate work (46.8%) compared with the proportion of mothers of non–modal group respondents who had continued their education beyond the technical programs (25.1%);

although the level of education completed by mothers of respondents in both groups rose from earlier to later Classes, the rise for the mothers of the modal group respondents was dramatic; this increase in the additional years of education reported by mothers of modal group respondents in the later Classes is not seen for the comparable group of non–modal mothers;

one inference to be made was that the modal group mothers used education as a means of socio–economic rise, while the non–modal group mothers no longer used this avenue for self–enhancement, but rather ventured more into proprietorships in the business world (See Table MG #3 Occupation of Mother).

COMPARISON OF EDUCATION COMPLETED BY FATHER AND BY MOTHER

A comparison was made of the proportion of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents for two levels of education completed by father and by mother, namely, high school graduation and less and more than high school graduation. The findings of this comparison for the total groups and 2 Class groupings in each are presented in Table MG #6.

Table MG #6. Percent of Responses for Two Educational Levels of Father and Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes.

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
Fathers	N	High School & Less %	Post High School %	N	High School & Less %	Post High School %
Total	100	55.0	45.0	119	50.4	49.5
Classes 1954–64	53	71.7	28.3	87	55.1	44.8
Classes 1965–69	47	36.1	63.8	32	37.5	62.4
Mothers						
Total	100	42.0	58.0	119	48.7	51.3
Classes 1954–64	53	54.7	45.2	87	48.2	51.7
Classes 1965–69	47	27.7	72.3	32	50.0	50.0

The findings presented in Table MG #6 indicated that

mothers of respondents had a slightly higher level of education than did fathers; this difference was more evident among the parents of the modal group respondents than the non–modal group respondents; one exception to this overall difference was evident in the parents of respondents in the non–modal Classes of 1965 through 1969 among whom the fathers, on the average, had completed a higher level of education than had the mothers;

the changes in the level of education of parents from less education to more education were greater, over time, for both fathers and mothers in the modal group than in the non–modal group; the mothers in the non–modal group evidenced no change in level of education completed over time.

The writers proposed the hypothesis that the mothers of the modal group respondents may have served as better role models for respondents in the matter of educational achievement than did the mothers of non–modal group respondents in that the focus for the model group mothers was on upward mobility through academics.

On the basis of the findings related to occupations and education of parents of respondents in the modal group, the writers proposed an additional hypthesis, that the continuous work record of the modal group respondents may have been positively associated with a view of nursing as a means of achieving upward socio–economic mobility.

NURSING EDUCATION OF MOTHER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the level of nursing education, if any, completed by their mothers (Question 4 Q One) is presented in Table MG #7.

Table MG #7. Percent of Responses for Level of Nursing Education Completed by Mother for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Did Your Mother Receive Any Education in Nursing?			
		No	Yes Not RN	Yes RN not BN	Yes RN and BN
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%
Total	100	90.0	2.0	7.0	1.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	94.3	1.9	3.8	0.0
Classes 1965–1969	47	85.1	2.1	10.6	2.1
Non–modal Group					
Total	119	84.9	5.0	10.1	0.0
Classes 1954–1964	87	83.9	6.9	9.2	0.0
Classes 1965–1969	32	87.5	0.0	12.5	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #7 indicated that

there was a slightly higher proportion of mothers of non–modal group respondents than of modal group respondents who had had some education in nursing; the level of this kind of education, among mothers of respondents in both groups, was concentrated in the category of registered nurses who did not hold the bachelor degree in nursing and this level of nursing education was more evident among mothers of respondents in the later than in the earlier Classes in both groups.

The sample on which these findings are based is admittedly small. However, the writers suggested that having mothers who were registered nurses, or who had studied nursing but were not registered nurses, was somewhat negatively related to the degree to which the respondent followed a continuous nursing career.

SIBLING BIRTH ORDER

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding their birth order among siblings (Question 8 Q One) is presented in Table MG #8.

Table MG #8. Percent of Responses for Birth Order Among Siblings for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Sibling Birth Order			
		Only Child	Oldest Child	Youngest Child	None of These
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%
Total	100	14.0	35.0	26.0	25.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	13.2	35.8	28.3	22.6
Classes 1965–1969	47	14.9	34.0	23.4	27.7
Non–modal Group					
Total	119	10.1	40.3	29.4	20.2
Classes 1954–1964	87	10.5	39.1	31.0	19.5
Classes 1965–1969	32	9.4	43.8	25.0	21.9

The findings presented in Table MG #8 indicated that

there was no difference, worthy of note, in the proportion of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups and in the Class groupings in the four categories of birth order of the respondents.

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the number of sibling they had, if any, (Question 9 Q One) is presented in Table MG #9.

Table MG #9. Percent of Responses for Number of Siblings for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Siblings Living Past Infancy								
Modal Group	N	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight or more
Total	99	15.2	45.5	17.2	7.1	7.1	4.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	13.2	50.9	11.3	5.7	7.5	5.7	3.8	1.9	0.0
Classes 1965–1969	46	17.4	39.1	23.9	8.7	6.5	2.2	0.0	2.2	0.0
Non–modal Group										
Total	119	10.9	41.2	21.0	10.9	8.4	4.2	1.7	0.0	1.7
Classes 1954–1964	87	10.3	39.1	20.7	11.5	9.2	4.6	2.3	0.0	2.3
Classes 1965–1969	32	12.5	46.9	21.9	9.4	6.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

The findings in Table MG #9 indicated that

respondents in the modal group, as a whole, came from somewhat smaller families (average number of children 2.75) than did the respondents in the non–modal group (average number of children 2.94); the same was true for respondents in the earlier Classes of the modal group (average number of children 2.84) compared to their classmates in the non–modal group (average number of children 3.06); the relationship was reversed, however, for respondents in the later Classes in which the respondents in the modal group came from slightly larger families (average number of children 2.65) than did the respondents in the non–modal group (average number of children 2.59).

FINANCIAL AID FOR UTCN PROGRAM

A comparison of the percent of responses from modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the financial aid they received, if any, while they were students at UTCN (Question 2 Q One) is presented in Table MG #10.

Table MG #10. Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Did You Receive Financial Aid While Attending UTCN?			
		Sources			
		UTCN	Other	Employ. Part–time	No.
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%
Total	97	16.5	17.5	9.3	56.7
Classes 1954–1964	52	5.7	15.4	13.5	65.4
Classes 1965–1969	45	28.9	20.0	4.4	46.7
Non–modal Group					
Total	117	11.1	14.5	16.2	58.1
Classes 1954–1964	85	4.7	12.9	17.6	64.7
Classes 1965–1969	32	28.1	18.7	12.5	40.6

The findings presented in Table MG #10 indicated that

there was little difference in the proportion of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups who received financial support from outside their families for their education at UTCN despite the fact that the non–modal group probably came from a higher socio–economic group than did the modal group;

*the big increase in the proportion of respondents receiving financial aid from UTCN, from the earlier to the later Classes in both groups, may best be understood as manifesting the significant increase in *federal support availability.*

---

*See Chapter 1, Volume 2, Table Q 2 #3 for availability of funds by calendar year.

PERSONAL HISTORY SINCE GRADUATION

For the comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the region of their principal residence since graduation see Volume 1 Chapter 7 Table MG #3.

MARITAL STATUS

A comparison of the percent of responses for 5 categories of current marital status for modal and non–modal group respondents (Question 49 Q One and Questions 21 and 22 Q Two) is presented in Tables MG #11 and #12.

Table MG #11. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One

		Marital Status				
		Widowed	Divorced	Separated	Married	Never Married
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	0.0	4.0	2.0	64.0	30.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	0.0	3.8	1.9	66.0	28.3
Classes 1965–1969	47	0.0	4.3	2.1	61.7	31.9
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	0.8	0.0	0.0	93.3	5.9
Classes 1954–1964	87	1.1	0.0	0.0	95.4	3.4
Classes 1965–1969	32	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5

The findings presented in Table MG #11 indicated that

the modal and non–modal groups differed sharply in the proportion of respondents who reported that they had never married and the differences was greatest between the respondents in the earlier Classes of both groups who answered Q One from 3–13 years after graduation;

as was to be expected, the proportion of the non–modal group respondents who reported having married was considerably greater at both 2 years and 3–13 years after graduation than it was for their classmates who had been active in nursing over the same time periods;

the greater proportion of respondents in the modal group, both early and later Classes, than in the non–modal group that reported being divorced and separated is noteworthy; this finding could suggest the greater importance of career as opposed to marriage for respondents in the modal group.

Table MG #12. Percent of Responses for Current Marital Status for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q Two

		Marital Status				
		Widowed	Divorced	Separated	Married	Never Married
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	0.0	6.0	0.0	72.0	22.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	0.0	3.8	0.0	*73.6	22.6
G–R Int. 8–18 yrs						
Classes 1965–1969	47	0.0	8.5	0.0	*70.2	21.3
G–R Int 7 years						
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	0.8	1.7	0.0	95.0	2.5
Classes 1954–1964	87	1.1	2.3	0.0	94.3	2.3
G–R Int 8–18 years						
Classes 1965–1969	32	0.0	0.0	0.0	96.9	3.1
G–R Int 7 years						

*One respondent had divorced and remarried in the 5 year period between Q One and Q Two.

The findings presented in Tables MG #11 and #12 indicated that

the proportion of respondents in both the modal and non–modal groups who had never married decreases over the five year period between questionnaires; however, slightly more than 20% of the modal group respondents had never married at periods ranging from 7 to 18 years after graduation whereas only 2.3 to 3.1% of the non–modal respondents reported the same status;

the proportion of modal group respondents who reported being divorced at the time they responded had increased with twice the proportion in the later Classes reporting being divorced at 7 years out of school as had reported it at 2 years out of school;

divorced status was reported on Q Two for the first time among non–modal respondents in the earlier Classes, 8 to 18 years out of school but in small proportions;

A path study from Q One to Q Two of the marital status of respondents in the modal group indicated that

of the 4 respondents who were divorced at the time they answered Q One, 3 had remarried and 1 remained divorced at the time they answered Q Two;

of the 2 who were separated, both were divorced when they answered Q Two;

of the 30 who had not married when they answered Q One, 8 were married when they answered Q Two;

of the 64 respondents who were married, 3 divorced and remained divorced when they answered Q Two while an additional 2 divorced and remarried in the five year period between questionnaires.

A path study from Q One to Q Two of the marital status of respondents in the non–modal group indicated that

the one respondent who was a widow when she answered Q One was remarried when she answered Q Two;

of the 7 respondents who had not married when they answered Q One, 4 had married when they answered Q Two;

of the 111 who were married, 1 was widowed and 2 were divorced when they answered Q Two.

TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal group respondents for the time they were first married (Question 51 Q One) is presented in Table MG #13.

Table MG #13. Percent of Responses for Time First Married for Modal and Non–Modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
Time of First Marriage	Total N=70 %	Classes 1954–64 N=38 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %	Total N=112 %	Classes 1954–64 N=84 %	Classes 1965–69 N=28 %
Before first enrollment at UTCN	2.9	0.0	6.3	0.9	1.2	0.0
Before senior year of first enrollment	15.7	21.1	9.4	17.9	17.9	17.9
During senior year of first enrollment	10.0	7.9	12.5	17.0	19.0	10.7
Within one year of graduation from UTCN	38.6	31.6	46.9	34.8	32.1	42.9
From one to three years after graduation	18.6	13.2	*25.0	19.6	16.7	*28.6
More than three years after graduation	14.3	26.3	XX	9.8	13.1	XX
Total	100.1	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1

The findings presented in Table MG #13 indicated that

there was an appreciable difference between the proportions of the respondents in the earlier Classes of the two groups who married before and during enrollment at UTCN; the proportion was greater for the non–modal respondents than for the modal respondents; no such difference eixsted for the respondents in the later Classes;

the proportion of modal group respondents who were first married before they graduated from UTCN was constant from earlier to later Classes, whereas it decreased noticeably among respondents in the non–modal group over time.

---

*These respondents answered Q One two years after graduation.

FIANCÉ'S ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ENGAGEMENT

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal group respondents regarding the activity of the fiancé at the time of the engagement (Question 52 Q One) is presented in Table MG #14.

Table MG #14. Percent of Responses for Activity of Fiancé at Time of Engagement for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Activity of Fiancé at Time of Engagement	N=70 %	N=38 %	N=32 %	N=111 %	N=84 %	N=27 %
Student at UT Medical Units	14.3	7.9	21.9	41.4	41.7	40.7
Undergraduate at other college	15.7	13.2	18.8	14.4	13.1	18.5
Graduate student	4.3	2.6	6.3	2.7	2.4	3.7
Qualified practitioner in health related field	4.3	5.3	3.1	16.2	14.3	22.2
None of these is applicable	61.4	71.1	50.0	25.2	28.6	14.8
Total	100.0	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.1	99.9

The findings presented in Table MG #14 indicated that

respondents in the non–modal group as a whole and in the 2 Class groups, became engaged to persons who were students at the University of Tennessee Medical Units and persons who were qualified practitioners in health related fields in much higher proportions than did their classmates in the modal group.

AGE AND FAMILY SITUATION OF RESPONDENT

A comparison of the percent of responses for the modal and non–modal group respondents for each of the age and age of children categories (Question 48 Q One and Question 23 Q Two) is presented in Table A14 Appendix.

The findings of the comparison are presented in Summary Table MG #15. The 16 categories in Table A14 were collapsed into 4 categories in Summary Table MG #15.

Summary Table MG #15. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Age, Marital Status and Age of Children for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Q One and Q Two

Categories of Age, Marital Status and Age of Children	Modal Group				Non–modal Group			
	Q One Responses		Q Two Responses		Q One Responses		Q Two Responses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never married	30	30.0	22	22.0	7	5.9	2	1.7
Married – no children	38	38.0	17	17.0	26	21.8	3	2.5
All children under 12 Yrs.	32	32.0	48	48.0	85	71.5	83	69.8
All children under 20 and over 3½ years	0	0.0	13	13.0	1	0.8	*31	25.9
Total	100	100.0	100	100.0	119	100.0	119	99.9

The findings presented in summary Table MG #15 indicated that

less than 5% of the non–modal respondents were childless at the time they answered Q Two, 7 to 18 years after graduation whereas almost 40% of the modal group respondents were childless at that time;

among the respondents who had children, the non–modal group had a greater proportion of children than did the modal group in both the younger and the older age brackets;

being unmarried or being childless if married was clearly related to being a member of the modal group;

the writers assumed that the difference in the degree to which respondents in the two groups were employed in nursing (Chapter 7, Volume 1, Table MG #9) was positively associated with these findings.

---

*Includes 1 child who had left the household

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the number of living children each had (Question 50 Q One) is presented in Table MG #16.

Table MG #16. Percent of Responses for Number of Living Children for Modal and Non–modal. Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Children						
		None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six or more
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	70	57.1	17.1	15.7	8.6	1.4	0.0	0.0
Classes 1954–64	38	36.8	18.4	26.3	15.8	2.6	0.0	0.0
Classes 1965–69	32	81.3	15.6	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non–modal Group								
Total	112	22.3	21.4	31.3	15.2	9.8	0.0	0.0
Classes 1954–64	84	7.0	19.0	40.6	20.2	13.1	0.0	0.0
Classes 1965–69	28	67.9	28.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The average number of living children per respondent for the modal and non--modal respondents by 2 groups of Classes is presented in Table MG #17.

Table MG #17. Average Number of Children per Respondent for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

Modal Group	Respondents N	Children N	Average
Total	70	56	0.80
Classes 1954–1964	38	49	1.28
Classes 1965–1969	32	7	0.21
Non–Modal Group			
Total	112	189	1.68
Classes 1954–1964	84	179	2.10
Classes 1965–1969	28	10	0.35

The findings presented in Tables MG #16 and #17 indicated that, as might be expected, respondents in the non–modal group reported having twice the average number of children that the modal group reported; further, the modal respondents were much more likely than were their non–modal classmates to have no children.

HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

A comparison of the percent of responses from ever married modal and non–modal respondents regarding the husband's occupation (Question 55 Q One) is presented in Table MG #18.

Table MG #18. Percent of Responses for Husband's Occupation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Husband's Occupation	N=60 %	N=32 %	N=28 %	N=99 %	N=74 %	N=25 %
Profession	41.7	43.8	39.3	77.9	78.4	76.0
Business official	13.3	12.5	14.3	9.1	9.5	8.0
Salesman	8.3	6.3	10.7	3.0	2.7	4.0
Clerical worker	5.0	9.4	0.0	2.0	2.7	0.0
Technician, semi-professional worker	11.7	15.6	7.1	2.0	2.7	0.0
Service worker	3.3	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student	16.7	12.5	21.4	5.1	2.7	12.0
Farm owner	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.4	0.0
Total	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.1	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #18 indicated that

the difference in the proportion of husbands in the category of professions between modal and non–modal respondents was striking; furthermore, it was noteworthy that professions was the only category in which the proportion of husbands of non–modal respondents was greater than the proportion of husbands of modal respondents;

the proportion of husbands of modal respondents was greater than that for husbands of non–modal respondentss in all the other occupational categories with the exception of the category of service workers for the Classes of 1954 to 1964 and clerical workers for the Classes of 1965 to 1969; for these two categories and these two Class groups, there was no difference in the proportion of responses.

A comparison of the percent of responses from ever married modal and non–modal respondents who reported that their husband's occupation was a profession, by 7 categories of professions, is presented in Table MG #19.

Table MG #19. Percent of Responses for Husband's Profession for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69	Total	Classes 1954–64	Classes 1965–69
Husband's Profession	N=25 %	N=14 %	N=11 %	N=77 %	N=58 %	N=19 %
Physician	16.0	7.1	27.3	61.0	67.2	42.1
Dentist	12.0	21.4	0.0	10.4	10.3	10.5
Pharmacist	8.0	7.1	9.1	10.4	5.2	26.3
Teacher	24.0	35.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Engineer	12.0	14.3	9.1	3.9	5.2	0.0
Minister	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.7	5.3
Other, including not specified	*28.0	14.3	45.5	**11.7	10.3	15.8
Total	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #19 indicated that

there was no difference in the proportion of responses from the total modal and non–modal groups for the professions of dentist, pharmacist, engineer and minister as followed by husbands;

the differences in the proportion of responses from the total groups indicated a greater proportion of responses from the modal group for husbands in the teacher category and the "other" category while there was a greater proportion of responses from the non–modal group for husbands in the physician category;

the differences in the proportion of responses from the Classes 1954 to 1964 indicated a greater proportion of responses from the modal group for husbands in the dentist, teacher, engineer and "other" categories while there was a greater proportion of responses from the non–modal group for husbands in the physician category;

there was a slightly smaller difference between the proportion of modal and non–modal respondents who identified husbands who were physicians in the later Classes than was the case for the earlier Classes.

* one respondent did not specify a particular profession. 1 each specified systems analyst, accountant, optometrist, bacteriologist, assistant professor and pilot.

**one respondent did not specify a particular profession. 1 each specified government career man, optometrist, biochemist, chemist, real estate appraiser, air force officer and air force pilot.

CAREER CHOICE AND CAREER SATISFACTION

CAREER CHOICE

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the factor that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career (Question 57 Q One) is presented in Table MG #20.

Table MG #20. Percent of Responses for Factor that Most Influenced Choice of Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–Modal Group		
Factors Influencing Choice of Nursing	Total N=96 %	Classes 1954–64 N=49 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=119 %	Classes 1954–64 N=87 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %
Parents or immediate relatives	21.9	20.4	23.4	29.4	24.1	43.8
Teachers (at any level)	3.1	6.1	0.0	1.7	1.1	3.1
Someone in the field nursing	8.3	2.0	14.9	9.2	12.6	0.0
Military experience	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Financial pressures	1.0	0.0	2.1	1.7	2.3	0.0
Summer job in hospital or health related field	5.2	0.0	10.6	8.4	5.7	15.6
Active recruitment on part of nursing (e.g. brochures, etc.)	2.1	4.1	0.0	5.9	5.7	6.3
Someone in general health field (e.g. doctor, dentist)	12.5	12.2	12.8	5.9	6.9	3.1
Other (specify)	17.7	22.4	12.8	15.1	18.4	6.3
Don't know	28.1	32.7	23.4	22.7	23.0	21.9
Total	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.1

The factors that respondents in the two groups specified when they marked the "other" option are listed below;

Factors Specified Under "Other" Responses as Important to Modal and Non–Modal Respondents in Choice of Nursing as Career

Modal Group Responses N	"Other" Factors	Non–modal Group Responses N
7	Personal desire to be a nurse	10
3	Service to humanity, interest in health and science	2
2	Call to serve God	1
1	Recruitment by a mission board	0
1	Desire to study medicine, insufficient funds	0
1	Illness of self, death in family	2
1	Parents in home where she sat with children	0
0	Books about nursing	1
1	Employment opportunity and security	2
17		18

The findings presented in Table MG #20 indicated that

approximately one quarter of the respondents in each group were unable to identify a single factor from among the options that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career; this uncertainty was most evident among respondents in the earlier Classes in the modal group and least evident among respondents in the later Classes in the non–modal group;

approximately one quarter of the respondents in each group identified parents or close relatives as the most important influence in their choice of nursing as a career; in the later Classes in the non–modal group, parents and close relatives accounted for nearly 45% of responses;

respondents in the modal group identified someone in nursing and someone in the general health field more frequently (20.8% of responses) than did the respondents in the non–modal group (15.1% of responses); it is worthy of note that a comparison of responses from members of the later Classes in each group indicated that 27.7% of the modal group respondents compared to 3.1% of the non–modal group respondents identified these health professionals as the factor that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career;

active recruitment on the part of nursing was identified by a small proportion of respondents in each group and it is worthy of note that among respondents in the later Classes, the modal group respondents did not identify it at all;

among the respondents who marked the "other" option (approximately 16% of each group) the factor that was most frequently specified was a personal desire to be a nurse, with religious and humanitarian motives ranking next in frequency.

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING AS A CAREER

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding their perceptions of attitudes held by lower, middle and upper classes of the general public in relation to nursing as a career (Question 58 Q One and Question 27 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #21.

Responses were given decreasing values, from 5 to 1, for attitudes perceived as very favorable, favorable, indifferent, unfavorable and very unfavorable.

Table MG #21. Average Values for Most to Least Favorable Attitude Toward Nursing as Career as Perceived by Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One and Q Two

		General Public					
		Lower Class		Middle Class		Upper Class	
Modal Group	N	Q One AV Value	Q Two AV Value	Q One AV Value	Q Two AV Value	Q One AV Value	Q Two AV Value
Total	99	4.49	4.48	4.00	4.13	3.15	3.25
Classes 1954–64	52	4.36	4.44	3.96	4.19	3.19	3.33
Classes 1965–69	47	4.63	4.53	4.04	4.06	3.10	3.17
Non–modal Group							
Total	114	4.35	4.35	4.22	4.31	3.31	3.49
Classes 1954–64	83	4.34	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.28	3.54
Classes 1965–69	31	4.38	4.32	4.21	4.32	3.34	3.36

The findings presented in Table MG #21 indicated that

although all the averages calculated for responses from the modal and non–modal respondents fell between values of 5 (very favorable) and 3 (indifferent), the distribution of the average values along this continuum indicated some differences in perception of attitudes between the two major groups, the two subgroups in each and the responses to Q One and Q Two;

there was a greater range between the most favorable attitudes perceived for the lower class and the least favorable perceived for the upper class among modal group respondents than among non–modal group respondents; the maximum range was recorded by modal group members in Classes 1964 to 1969 whose average rating for lower class perceptions was nearer to very favorable than it was to just favorable and whose average rating for upper class perceptions was closer to indifferent than to favorable;

the members of the modal group perceived the attitude of the lower class to be more favorable toward a career in nursing than did the members of the non–modal group; the most favorable perception was that of the modal group members in Classes 1965 to 1969;

the members of the non–modal group perceived the middle and upper classes to have more favorable attitudes toward nursing as a career than did the members of the modal group; the least favorable rating perceived for the upper class was reported by the modal group members in Classes 1965 to 1969;

there was no change in perception of lower class attitudes from Q One to Q Two for the total groups; there was, however, a slight shift toward perception of more favorable attitudes on the part of the middle and upper classes, for the total groups from Q One to Q Two;

the one subgroup that recorded a shift toward perception of less favorable attitudes from Q One to Q Two was the modal group members in Classes 1965 to 1969 in their interpretation of lower class attitudes;

the subgroups that recorded the greatest shifts toward perceptions of more favorable attitudes between Q One and Q Two were the modal group members in Classes 1954 to 1964 in their interpretation of middle class attitudes and the non–modal group members in Classes 1954 to 1964 in their interpretation of upper class attitudes.

MOST IMPORTANT NURSING POSITION

A comparison of the percent of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the most important nursing position they ever held (Question 24 Q One) by title of position is presented in Table MG #22.

Table MG #22. Percent of Responses for Type of Most Important Nursing Position for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total	Grad.–Resp. Intervals		Total	Grad.–Resp. Intervals	
		3–13 years	2 years		3–13 years	2 years
Most Important Nursing Position Ever Held	N=93	N=47	N=46	N=100	N=72	N=28
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Staff or general duty nurse	34.4	12.8	56.5	48.0	37.5	75.0
Head nurse or assistant	11.8	12.8	10.9	11.0	12.5	7.1
Supervisor nurse or assistant	10.8	14.9	6.5	5.0	5.6	3.6
Nursing administrator or assistant	5.4	8.5	2.2	1.0	0.0	3.6
Nursing consultant	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.6
Nursing instructor or assistant	24.7	34.0	15.2	29.0	37.5	7.1
Nursing education administrator or assistant	4.3	8.5	0.0	2.0	2.8	0.0
Clinical specialist	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.8	0.0
Other	6.5	6.4	6.5	1.0	1.4	0.0
Total	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #22 indicated that

a greater proportion of respondents in the modal group than in the non–modal group, answering at 2 years out of school, were able to identify as important, positions above the staff nurse level in nursing service and instructor in nursing education positions;

in the period 3 to 13 years out of school, the modal group respondents identified as important, positions as supervisors and administrators in nursing service and administrators in nursing education to a greater degree than did respondents in the non–modal group;

a possible explanation put forward by the writers for the fact that 75% of the non–modal respondents who answered 2 years out of school, identified the staff nurse position as the most important they had ever held, was that it may have been the only position they held in this short period since graduation.

CAREER SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the relative importance of 6 reasons for present employment, excluding financial reasons, (Question 30 Q One) is presented in Table MG #23.

A common base for comparing the degrees of importance was developed by assigning 6 points to first place in importance, 5 points to second place and so on down to 1 point for sixth place in importance. The total points, percent of aggregate points and mean rank derived from each of the 6 reasons, for modal and non–modal respondents, by 2 graduation response intervals are presented in Table MG #23.

Table MG #23. Percent of Aggregate Points and Mean Rank for Responses to 6 Reasons (Non Financial) for Present Employment for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals

Reasons for Present Employment (non financial)	Modal Group G–R Interval 2 years N = Max 46 Points	%	Mean Rank	G–R Interval 3–13 years N = Max 49 Points	%	Mean Rank
Career commitment	133	14.2	3.16	150	15.6	3.57
Job satisfaction	185	19.8	4.20	225	23.4	4.59
People I meet	137	14.7	3.18	119	12.4	2.90
Service to others	195	20.9	4.33	201	20.9	4.36
Personal fulfillment	223	23.9	4.84	222	23.1	4.93
Scholarship commitment	61	6.5	1.45	43	4.5	1.10
Total	934	100.0		960	99.9	

Reasons for Present Employment (non financial)	Non–modal Group G–R Interval 2 years N = Max 22 Points	%	Mean Rank	G–R Interval 3–13 years N = Max 19 Points	%	Mean Rank
Career commitment	67	14.7	3.35	28	9.3	2.80
Job satisfaction	77	16.8	3.50	64	21.2	4.57
People I meet	62	13.6	2.95	47	15.6	3.35
Service to others	101	22.1	4.57	66	21.9	4.40
Personal fulfillment	117	25.6	5.31	87	28.8	5.43
Scholarship commitment	33	7.2	1.73	10	3.3	1.11
Total	457	100.0		302	100.1	

The findings presented in Table MG #23 indicated that

respondents in both modal and non–modal groups ranked personal fulfillment first as their reason (non financial) for being employed in nursing when they answered Q One;

second ranked by modal group respondents was job satisfaction, by non–modal group respondents it was service to others; these two reasons changed places between the two groups for third rank;

fourth, fifth and sixth ranks were assigned by respondents in both groups to career commitment, the people I meet and scholarship/traineeship commitment in that order;

the only reason that was rated higher by the 3–13 year modal subgroup than by the 3–13 non–modal subgroup was career commitment by 0.77 mean points;

the reasons the 3–13 year non–modal subgroup rated higher than did the 3–13 year modal subgroup were the people I meet by 0.45 mean points and personal fulfillment by 0.5 mean points;

the differences in ratings for job satisfaction, service to others and scholarship/traineeship commitment were negligible for the members of the 2 groups that were 3–13 years out of school;

the reasons that the 2 year modal subgroup rated higher than the 2 year non–modal subgroup did were job satisfaction by 0.70 mean points and the people I meet by 0.23 mean points;

the reasons that the 2 year non–modal subgroup rated higher than the 2 year modal subgroup did were career commitment by 0.19 mean points, service to others by 0.26 mean points, personal fulfillment by 0.47 mean points and scholarship/traineeship commitment by 0.28 mean points.

The writers suggested caution in interpretation of these findings because of the limited N in the non–modal sample, particularly in the 3–13 year sub–group.

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding how attractive to them, work in nursing was, compared to work in other fields (Question 59 Q One and Question 28 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #24.

A point system, on a scale of 5 down to 1 for most to least attractive, was used to calculate average values. The options were "much more attractive", "more attractive", "about the same", "less attractive" and "much less attractive".

Table MG #24. Average Points for Attractiveness of Work in Nursing for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes, Q One and Q Two

	Average Point Values for Attractiveness of Work in Nursing	
	Q One	Q Two
Modal Group N=100		
Total	3.33	3.54
Classes 1954–64 N=53	3.58	3.70
Classes 1965-69 N=47	3.04	3.36
Non–modal Group N=116		
Total	3.25	3.38
Classes 1954–64 N=84	3.00	3.50
Classes 1965–69 N=32	3.31	3.06

The findings presented in Table MG #24 indicated that

although the average ratings for both groups on both questionnaires fell between 3.00 (about the same) and 4.00 (more attractive), the ratings of the modal group were more favorable than were those of the non–modal group;

the ratings by respondents in both groups and all sub groups were more favorable on Q Two than on Q One with one exception, namely, work in nursing compared to work in other fields appeared less attractive on Q Two than it had been on Q One to the respondents in the later Classes of the non–modal group;

the highest rating for the attractiveness of work in nursing compared to work in other fields was given by the modal group respondents in the earlier Classes on Q Two when they were 8 to 18 years out of school.

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents for the likelihood that they would choose nursing as a career again (Question 60 Q One and Question 29 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #25.

Table MG #25. Percent of Responses for Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Likelihood of Choosing Nursing Again							
		Definitely No		Probably No		Probably Yes		Definitely Yes	
Modal Group	N	Q One %	Q Two %	Q One %	Q Two %	Q One %	Q Two %	Q One %	Q Two %
Total	100	2.0	2.0	18.0	12.2	39.0	37.8	41.0	48.0
Classes 1954–64	53	1.9	1.9	9.4	5.8	33.9	36.5	54.7	55.8
Classes 1965–69	47	2.1	2.2	27.7	19.6	44.7	39.1	25.5	39.1
Non–modal Group									
Total	116	1.7	0.9	10.3	14.5	42.2	42.7	45.7	41.8
Classes 1954–64	85	2.4	1.2	9.4	15.3	38.8	38.8	49.4	44.7
Classes 1965–69	31	0.0	0.0	12.9	12.5	51.6	53.1	35.5	34.4

The findings presented in Table MG #25 indicated that

knowing what they knew when they answered the questionnaires, the respondents in both groups would choose nursing again in a better than 4 to 1 ratio;

however, this ratio was reduced to 2 to 1 in the later modal group Classes on Q One, just two years after graduation; the response was less negative for these same respondents on Q Two, seven years after graduation;

there is considerably less difference in the responses of the two Class groupings in the modal group and on the two questionnaries than among their non–modal classmates.

The alternative careers that were specified (Question 30 Q Two) by respondents in the modal and non–modal groups who stated that they definitely or probably would not choose nursing if they had the choice to make again were:

	Modal Group Responses N	Non–modal Group Responses N
Teaching	1	2
Business office	2	2
Social work	1	3
Medicine	4	1
Physical therapy	0	3
Occupational therapy	0	1
Dental hygiene	0	1
Medical research	0	1
Veterinary medicine	1	0
Personnel work	1	0
Psychology	0	1
Home economics	1	0
Mathematics	1	0
Linguistics	1	0
Interpreter	1	0
Foreign service	1	0
Art	1	2
Antiques	1	0
Interior design	0	1
Total	17	18

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT AS A NURSE

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents regarding the husband's attitude toward her employment as a nurse (Question 54 Q One) is presented in Table MG #26.

Table MG #26. Percent of Responses for 5 Attitudes of Husband Re Employment as a Nurse for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes Q One

		Husband's Attitude Toward Respondent's Employment as a Nurse				
		Strongly Favors	Approves	Indifferent	Discourages	Opposes
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	*57	42.1	47.4	5.3	3.5	1.8
Classes 1954–1964	30	33.3	50.0	6.7	6.7	3.3
Classes 1965–1969	27	51.9	44.4	3.7	0.0	0.0
Non–modal Group						
Total	**87	20.7	46.0	8.0	17.2	8.0
Classes 1954–1964	63	12.7	47.6	7.9	22.2	9.5
Classes 1965–1969	24	41.7	41.7	8.3	4.2	4.2

*30 respondents who had never married were ineligible to answer Q 54. 13 who were eligible (18.6%) did not respond.

**7 respondents who had never married were ineligible to answer Q 54. 25 who were eligible (23.3%) did not respond.

The findings presented in Table MG #26 indicated that

in general, the ever married respondents in the modal group perceived their husbands as having more favorable attitudes toward their employment as nurses than was the case with respondents in the non–modal group;

the difference between the perceptions of respondents in the later Classes was less marked between modal and non–modal respondents than it was for those in the earlier Classes.

When the modal group respondents answered Question 22 Q Two, eight of them had married for the first time in the interval since Q One. Seven of them reported the attitudes they perceived their husbands to hold toward their employment as nurses; four strongly favored it and three approved it.

Five modal group respondents had married for a second time in the interval since they answered Q One; three of their husbands strongly favored their employment as nurses and two approved it.

When the attitudes of the 12 additional husbands identified on Q Two were added to those of the 57 husbands identified by modal group respondents on Q One, the proportions of responses were as follows:

Strongly favors	44.9%
Approves	46.4%
Indifferent	4.3%
Discourages	2.9%
Opposes	1.4%

Forty modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had remained the same (Question 25 Q Two) over the interval between Q One and Q Two. The proportions for these unchanged attitudes were as follows:

Strongly favors	45.0%
Approves	52.5%
Indifferent	2.5%

Six modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had changed between Q One and Q Two. The changes were:

one from favorable to unfavorable
four from unfavorable to favorable
one from indifferent to favorable

When the non–modal group respondents answered Question 22 Q Two, four of them had married for the first time in the interval between Q One and Q Two. One of them reported that her husband discouraged her employment as a nurse, while the remaining three did not answer Question 22 Q Two.

One non–modal group respondent reported that she had married for a second time in the interval between Q One and Q Two; she reported that her husband discouraged her employment as a nurse.

As would be expected, the addition of the responses for these two non–modal group respondents to the findings presented in Table MG #26 did not alter them appreciably.

Sixty–two non–modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had remained unchanged (Question 25 Q Two) over the interval between Q One and Q Two. The proportions for these unchanged attitudes were as follows:

Strongly favors	24.2%
Approves	46.8%
Indifferent	4.8%
Discourages	17.7%
Opposes	6.5%

Seventeen non–modal group respondents recorded that they felt the attitudes of their husbands had changed between Q One and Q Two. The changes were:

seven from favorable to unfavorable
six from unfavorable to favorable
three from indifferent to favorable
one from indifferent to unfavorable

LASTING FRIENSHIPS AMONG RESPONDENTS

A comparison of the responses of modal and non–modal respondents regarding the number of classmates with whom they had maintained friendships since graduation (Question 56 Q One) is presented in Table MG #27.

Table MG #27. Percent of Responses for Number of Classmates Counted as Friends for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of UTCN Classmates Counted as Friends								
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight-or More	None
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	99	4.0	11.1	7.1	10.1	20.2	19.2	8.1	17.2	3.0
Classes 1954–64	52	5.8	9.6	9.6	13.5	7.7	23.1	7.7	19.2	3.8
Classes 1965–69	47	2.1	12.8	4.3	6.4	34.0	14.9	8.5	14.9	2.1
Non–modal Group										
Total	118	5.9	10.2	14.4	12.7	11.9	7.6	4.2	27.1	5.9
Classes 1954–64	87	6.9	11.5	13.8	12.6	10.3	6.9	5.7	27.6	4.6
Classes 1965–69	31	3.2	6.5	16.1	12.9	16.1	9.7	0.0	25.8	9.7

The findings presented in Table MG #27 indicated that

in general and in the two Class groupings, respondents in the modal group counted larger numbers of their former classmates as friends at the time they answer Q One than was the case for respondents in the non–modal group;

this difference was more noticeable among respondents in the later Classes than in the earlier Classes.

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

POST BACCALAUREATE EDUCATION

A comparison of the responses of the modal and non–modal respondents regarding having earned a master's degree since graduation from UTCN (Question 10 Q One, Question 14 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #28.

There were 37 master's degrees reported in the combined responses to Q One and Q Two by modal respondents, two of whom reported two master's degrees each. One additional modal respondent reported a master's degree but did not indicate a major. Three modal respondents each reported holding a doctorate, one in education, one in philosophy and one in juris prudence.

There were 10 master's degrees reported in the combined responses to Q One and Q Two by non–modal respondents.

Table MG #28. Number of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents Reporting Master's Degrees, by Major and by Class

		Modal Group Master's Degrees		Non–modal Group Master's Degrees	
Class	G–R Int	Q One Nursing Majors N	Q Two Non–Nursing Majors N	Q One Nursing Majors N	Q Two Non–Nursing Majors N
1954	18	1	3	1	0
1955	17	1	0	0	0
1956	16	3	1	1	0
1957	15	0	2	0	1
1958	14	1	1	0	0
1959	13	2	1	0	1
1960	12	1	0	0	0
1961	11	0	1	0	0
1962	10	4	0	0	0
1963	9	0	0	0	0
1964	8	0	1	2	1
1965	7	2	0	0	0
1966	7	2	0	0	1
1967	7	0	1	0	0
1968	7	5	1	0	0
1969	7	2	1	2	0
Total		24	13	6	4

There were 50 master's degrees reported by all the generic program respondents in the Classes 1954 through 1964 including those with a major in nursing (N=31) and non nursing (N=19). (See Table Q 10 #18 Chapter 2 Volume 1)

There were 47 master's degrees reported by the modal and non–modal respondents in these same Classes. There were, therefore, 3 of the 50 master's degrees (6%) that were reported by generic program respondents who qualified for neither the modal nor the non–modal group.

A comparison of the findings presented in Table MG #28 with those in Table Q 10 #18 indicated that

the modal group respondents accounted for 24 of the 31 (77.4%) of the master's degrees with majors in nursing that were reported by all the generic program respondents in the Classes 1954 through 1969; however, they accounted for only 12 of the 19 (63.2%) of the masters degrees with non nursing majors reported by the same segment of the total population;

the non–modal respondents accounted for 2 of the 31 (19.4%) of the master's degrees with nursing majors and 4 of the 19 (21.1%) of the master's degrees with non nursing majors that were reported by all the generic program respondents in the Classes 1954 through 1969.

The obvious inference from these findings was that there was more likelihood that respondents who hold the master's degree, and more specifically a master's degree with a major in nursing, would follow continuous careers in nursing than was the case for their classmates who held master's degrees with non nursing majors or did not hold the master's degree.

HONOR SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP

No meaningful conclusions could be drawn from a comparison of the small number of respondents in the modal and non–modal groups who reported membership in honor societies. Because of the time factor described in the interpretation of the findings in Table Q 67 #3, Chapter 5 Volume 2, all members of the modal and non–modal groups had graduated prior to the establishment of the local honor society, Upsilon Tau in 1970 and the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau, the national honor society of nursing in 1972.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning membership status in the American Nurses' Association (Question 61 Q One) is presented in Table MG #29.

Table MG #29. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		ANA Membership Status		
Modal Group	N	Currently Member %	Previously Member %	Never Member %
Total	100	54.0	28.0	18.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	54.7	39.6	5.7
Classes 1965–1969	47	53.2	14.9	31.9
Non–Modal Group				
Total	119	10.1	56.3	33.6
Classes 1954–1964	87	5.7	62.1	32.2
Classes 1965–1969	32	21.9	40.6	37.5

The findings presented in Table MG #29 indicated that

as was to be expected, respondents in the modal group were members of ANA, at the time they answered Q One, at a considerably higher rate than was the case for respondents in the non–modal group; also expected was the fact that the sharpest difference in this rate was evident among members of the earlier Classes;

the difference in the rate of membership among respondents in the later Classes in the two groups, was also considerable; two years after graduation, when less in the way of differences would be expected, there was evidence that, although the proportion of respondents in both groups that had ever been members in the two year period was relatively equal, the proportion that maintained current membership at the end of the two year period in the modal group was almost two and a half times that in the non–modal group.

The writers suggest that this criterion of professionalism has potential as an indicator of the proportion of any group of relatively new graduates who may be expected to engage in continuous careers in nursing.

A comparison of responses of the modal and non–modal respondents who had even been members of ANA, concerning the degree of their participation at local, state and national levels of the organization (Question 62 Q One) is presented in Table MG #30.

Table MG #30. Percent of Responses for Participation in ANA at 3 Levels, by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total N=*82 %	Classes 1954–64 N=50 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %	Total N=*79 %	Classes 1954–64 N=59 %	Classes 1965–69 N=20 %
Levels of ANA and Degrees of Participation						
Local Level						
Leadership, officer, committee chairman	17.1	22.0	9.4	6.3	8.5	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	26.8	28.0	25.0	15.2	18.6	5.0
Minimal, pay dues, occasionally attend	56.1	50.0	65.6	78.5	72.9	95.0
State Level						
Leadership, officer, committee chairman	3.7	6.0	0.0	1.3	1.7	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	11.0	14.0	6.3	6.3	8.5	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend.	85.4	80.0	93.8	92.4	89.8	100.0
National Level						
Leadership, officer, committee chairman	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.7	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	1.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend	98.8	98.0	100.0	98.7	98.3	100.0

*Only those respondents who were currently or had been previously members of ANA Q One.

The findings presented in Table MG #30 indicated that

as was to be expected, the participation of respondents in both groups at the national level of ANA was minimal; the differences in the degree of participation between respondents in the earlier Classes of the two groups is evident at the state organization level but to an even greater extent at the local level; the differences in the degrees of participation of respondents in the later Classes was consistent with the findings presented in Table MG #29 (ANA Membership Status) and could be used to enhance the value of continued membership as a tool to predict the likelihood of continuous activity in nursing.

On Q Two, thirty–four modal group respondents reported being active in ANA during the five year interval between questionnaires:

twenty of them (59%) were officers, chairmen of committees or active otherwise in the local association,
thirteen of them (38%) were similarly active at the state level and
one respondent (3%) was chairman of a national committee.

Only two non–modal respondents reported any degree of activity at any level of ANA on Q Two.

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning membership status in the National League for Nursing (Question 63 Q One) is presented in Table MG #31.

Table MG #31. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		NLN Membership Status		
Modal Group	N	Current Membership %	Previous Membership %	Never a Member %
Total	100	18.0	14.0	68.0
Classes 1954–1964	53	30.2	24.5	45.3
Classes 1965–1969	47	4.3	2.1	93.6
Non–modal Group				
Total	119	2.5	21.0	76.5
Classes 1954–1964	87	3.4	28.7	67.8
Classes 1965–1969	32	0.0	0.0	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #31 indicated that,

as was to be expected, the over all membership in NLN was considerably less than it was in ANA (Table MG #29);

the rate of membership in NLN in the modal group was higher than it was in the non–modal group and the sharpest difference was for current membership among respondents in the earlier Classes in the two groups;

the proportion of respondents in the later Classes who had even been members of NLN was too small to warrant comparisons.

A comparison of responses for the modal and non–modal respondents who had even been members of NLN, concerning the degree of their participation at local, state and national levels of the organization (Question 63 Q One) is presented in Table MG #32.

Table MG #32. Percent of Responses for Participation in NLN at 3 Levels, by 3 Degrees of Participation for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
	Total N=*32 %	Classes 1954–64 N=29 %	Classes 1965–69 N=3 %	Total N=*28 %	Classes 1954–64 N=28 %	Classes 1965–69 N=0 %
Levels of NLN and Degrees of Participation						
Local Level						
Leadership, officer committee chairman	12.5	13.8	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	21.9	24.1	0.0	17.9	17.9	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend	65.6	62.1	100.0	75.0	75.0	0.0
State Level						
Leadership, officer committee chairman	12.5	13.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Active, attend meetings, serve on committees	12.5	13.8	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0
Minimal, pay dues occasionally attend	75.0	72.4	100.0	85.7	85.7	0.0
National Level						
Leadership, officer committee chairman	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Active, attend meetings serve on committees	3.1	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minimal, pay dues, occasionally attend meetings	96.8	96.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

*Only those respondents who were currently or had been previously members of NLN Q One.

The findings presented in Table MG #32 indicated that

as was to be expected, members of the non–modal group reported no activity at the national level of NLN and the only respondents in the modal group who reported participation at the national level were members of the earlier Classes; their participation was to a minimal degree or slightly above;

members of the earlier Classes in the modal group recorded a greater degree of participation in local and state levels of NLN than did their classmates in the non–modal group;

members of the later Classes in the modal group recorded participation slightly above the minimal degree at the local and state levels of the organization while members of the later Classes in the non–modal group reported no membership.

A comparison of the findings presented in Tables MG #29 and MG #31 (membership status in ANA and NLN) indicated that

as was to be expected, in general, there was a higher rate of current and previous membershp in ANA than in NLN among the modal group respondents than among non–modal group respondents; this was true for the total groups and for the two groups of Classes.

No comparison of the findings presented in Tables MG #30 and MG #32 (degrees of participation in three levels of ANA and NLN) was made due to the small number of respondents who were members of NLN.

On Q Two, seven modal group respondents reported being active in NLN during the five year period between questionnaires. Three participated actively at local level, four at the state level and none at the national level.

No non–modal respondents reported being active in NLN on Q Two.

A comparison of responses regarding membership in *other professional organizations (excluding ANA and NLN, Question 65 Q One) for modal and non–modal respondents is presented in Table MG #33.

Table MG #33. Percent of Responses for Membership in Other Professional Organizations for Modal and Non–modal Respondents by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Other Membership				
		One	Two	Three	Four and More	None
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	13.0	6.0	1.0	0.0	80.0
Classes 1954–64	53	17.0	9.4	1.9	0.0	71.7
Classes 1965–69	47	8.5	2.1	0.0	0.0	89.4
Non–Modal Group						
Total	119	14.3	1.7	1.7	0.0	82.4
Classes 1954–64	87	10.3	2.3	2.3	0.0	85.1
Classes 1965–69	32	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0

The findings presented in Table MG 33 indicated that

the proportion of modal and non–modal respondents reporting membership in other professional organizations was relatively equal;

however, the proportion of respondents in the earlier Classes that reported membership in one and two other professional organizations was considerably higher for modal respondents than for non–modal respondents;

the situation was reversed for respondents in the later Classes in the two groups.

---

*Examples of such organizations given on Q One were: National Education Association, American Hospital Association, American Public Health Association.

A comparison of the responses of modal and non–modal respondents concerning the degree of participation reported in other professional organizations (Question 66 Q One) is presented in Table MG #34.

Table MG #34. Percent of Responses for 3 Degrees of Participation of Modal and Non–modal Respondents in Other Professional Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes

		Degrees of Participation		
Modal Group	N	Leadership %	Active %	Minimal %
Total	*20	15.0	20.0	65.0
Classes 1954–64	15	20.0	20.0	60.0
Classes 1965–69	5	0.0	20.0	80.0
Non–modal Group				
Total	*21	0.0	33.3	66.7
Classes 1954–64	13	0.0	46.2	53.8
Classes 1965–69	8	0.0	12.5	87.5

The findings presented in Table MG #34 indicated that

in general, modal group respondents reported a greater degree of participation in other professional organizations than did their non–modal classmates;

the respondents in the earlier Classes in both groups participated to a greater degree than did those in the later Classes;

only in the earlier Classes of the modal group did any respondents participate at the leadership level in other professional organizations.

*Only those respondents who reported being members of other professional organizations.

VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND WELFARE ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

A comparison of responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning membership in *voluntary health and welfare organizations (Question 68 Q One) is presented in Table MG #35.

Table MG #35. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes

		Memberships in Voluntary Health and Welfare Organizations				
Modal Group	N	None %	One %	Two %	Three %	Four or more %
Total	99	69.7	23.2	5.0	1.0	1.0
Classes 1954–64	52	63.5	28.8	5.8	0.0	1.9
Classes 1965–69	47	76.6	17.0	4.3	2.1	0.0
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	72.3	10.1	11.8	4.2	1.7
Classes 1954–64	87	70.1	11.5	11.5	4.6	2.3
Classes 1965–69	32	78.1	6.3	12.5	3.1	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #35 indicated that

the proportion of modal respondents who held membership in one voluntary health and welfare organization was greater than for their non–modal classmates; however, the proportion of them that held memberships in two and more such organizations was less than for their non–modal classmates.

---

*Examples of such organizations given on Q One were: Cancer Society, Heart Association, hospital board, Mental Health Association.

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

A comparison of responses of modal and non–modal respondents regarding their membership in voluntary community organizations such as religious, political, civic or educational groups (Question 69 Q One) is presented in Table MG #36.

Table MG #36. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations by 2 Groups of Classes

		Memberships in Voluntary Community Organizations				
		None	One	Two	Three	Four or More
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	38.0	35.0	21.0	5.0	1.0
Classes 1954–64	53	34.0	35.8	22.6	5.7	1.9
Classes 1965–69	47	42.6	34.0	19.1	4.3	0.0
Non–modal Group						
Total	119	27.7	33.6	19.3	11.8	7.6
Classes 1954–64	87	23.0	27.6	23.0	16.1	10.3
Classes 1965–69	32	40.6	50.0	9.4	0.0	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #36 indicated that

the proportion of respondents in both groups that held memberships in one and two voluntary community organizations was similar; the differences appeared among those who held memberships in three and more such organizations; among them the proportion of responses for non–modal respondents was more than twice what it was for the modal respondents;

the tendency for members of the earlier Classes to have more involvement in community organizations than was the case for members of the later Classes, in both groups, was to be expected on the basis of the longer graduation–response intervals for the earlier Classes.

PROFESSION JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

A comparison of the responses for modal and non–modal respondents concerning the number of nursing journals to which they subscribed (Question 70 Q One) is presented in Table MG #37.

Table MG #37. Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Number of Journal Subscriptions by 2 Groups of Classes

		Number of Subscriptions to Nursing Journals			
Modal Group	N	None %	One %	Two %	Three or more %
Total	100	32.0	46.0	17.0	5.0
Classes 1954–64	53	30.2	41.5	20.8	7.5
Classes 1965–69	47	34.0	51.1	12.8	2.1
Non–modal Group					
Total	119	67.2	27.7	5.0	0.0
Classes 1954–64	87	78.2	19.5	2.3	0.0
Classes 1965–69	32	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0

The findings presented in Table MG #37 indicated that

as was to be expected, although the rate at which modal and non–modal respondents in the later Classes subscribed to nursing journals was similar, it differed markedly in the earlier Classes, in which the rate for the modal respondents was more than three times that for the non–modal respondents.

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS, PUBLIC ADDRESSES, PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCH PROJECTS

A comparison of the percent of the modal and non–modal respondents who reported activities in consultations, public speaking, publication and research (Question 71 Q One and Questions 32 through 35 Q Two) is presented in Table MG #38.

Table MG #38. Percent of Respondents in Modal and Non–modal Groups Reporting Professional Activities by 2 Groups of Classes, Q One and Q Two

	Modal Group			Non–modal Group		
Professional Activities	Total N=100 %	Classes 1954–64 N=53 %	Classes 1965–69 N=47 %	Total N=119 %	Classes 1954–64 N=87 %	Classes 1965–69 N=32 %
Consultations	18.0	17.0	19.0	5.9	5.7	6.3
Public addresses	33.0	28.3	38.3	14.3	12.6	18.7
Publications	9.0	3.8	14.9	0.8	1.1	0.0
Research projects	5.0	7.5	2.1	2.5	2.3	3.1
None of these	35.0	43.4	25.7	76.5	78.3	71.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The findings presented in Table MG #38 indicated that

the professional activity in which both groups of respondents reported the most activity was public speaking;

as was to be expected, the proportion of modal respondents reporting participation in each of the four activities was greater than was the case for the non–modal respondents; this was true for the total population of each group and for the 2 Class groupings as well.

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

The opportunity to criticize Q Two (Question 39 Q Two) was utilized by a greater proportion of non–modal respondents (14%) than modal respondents (9%). Suggestions for improvement of the questionnaire were made by a very small proportion in each group; non–modal (3%) and modal (1%).

Only one non–modal respondent (0.8%) requested a report of the findings of the study, while 9 of the modal respondents (9%) made the same request.

Suggestions for improvement in the ways the College and the Alumnae Association could be more useful to respondents (Question 40 Q Two) were made by a greater proportion of non–modal respondents (28%) than modal respondents (17%). Half the suggestions from modal respondents were directed to the College and related to educational needs of the respondents, master's programs, while the suggestions made by the non–modal respondents were more heavily weighted with requests for non educational alumnae services.

The opportunity to identify things that were significant to them (Question 38 Q Two) that the questionnaire did not include was utilized by a higher proportion of non–modal respondents (23%) than modal respondents (7%); the things identified by modal respondents related to honors, awards, courses taken, professional contributions made while the things identified by non–modal respondents related to their lives as persons, not as employed nurses.

SUMMARY

Some of the major findings presented in Chapter 6 are summarized below:

The families of the respondents in the modal group represented a lower socio–economic class, on the basis of the level of education completed by the father and the occupation of the father, than did the families of the respondents in the non–modal group.

The mothers of modal respondents were employed outside the home to a greater degree than was the case with the mothers of the non–modal respondents; the level of education completed by mothers of modal respondents was higher than it was for mothers of non–modal respondents.

The families of modal respondents were slightly smaller, on the average, than those of the non–modal respondents.

Respondents in the non–modal group married earlier, married in greater numbers and remained married in greater numbers than was the case with respondents in the modal group.

Respondents in the non–modal group were married in larger numbers than were their modal classmates to men in the professions and the professions most heavily represented were the health related professions, while the professions of teaching, engineering and the "other" professions were more heavily represented by husbands of modal respondents.

Respondents in the non–modal group had more children and more of them were under 13 years of age at the time of reporting than was the case with modal group respondents.

The respondents in the non–modal group perceived their husbands to have less favorable attitudes toward their employment as nurses than did the respondents in the modal group.

Approximately one quarter of the respondents in each group was unable to identify a single factor that most influenced their choice of nursing as a career; another quarter in each group identified parents and close relatives as the most significant influence in their choice; the influence of persons in nursing and the other health related fields was more important for modal respondents, particularly those in the later Classes, than it was for the non–modal respondents.

The respondents in the model group perceived the attitude of people in the lower class of the general public to be more favorable toward a career in nursing than did the respondents in the non–modal group; respondents in the non–modal group perceived the attitude of the middle and upper classes to be more favorable toward a career in nursing than did respondents in the modal group; there was no change over time in the perceptions of lower class attitudes by either group of respondents, but there was a shift toward perception of more favorable attitudes on the part of the middle and upper classes by both groups of respondents over time.

Both modal and non–modal respondents ranked personal fulfillment, job satisfaction and service to others as their most important reasons, excluding financial reasons, for being employed in nursing; career commitment, the people I meet and scholarship/traineeship commitment fell considerably below the top ranked reasons in both groups.

The ratings the modal respondents gave to work in nursing when they compared it to work in other fields was more favorable than the rating non–modal respondents gave it; however, the average rating by both groups fell between the categories of "about the same" and "more attractive" than work in other fields.

Knowing what they knew at the time they made their responses, the respondents in both groups reported that they would choose nursing again in a better than 4 to 1 ratio.

In the matters of formal education beyond the bachelor's degree, participation in professional organizations, subscription to professional journals, publications and research, all accepted criteria of professionalism, it was not surprising to find that the modal respondents, with their continuous involvement with nursing, reported higher levels of achievement and activity than did respondents in the non–modal group.

More respondents in the modal group expressed an interest in receiving a report of the findings of the longitudinal career pattern study than did their non–modal classmates. Their suggestions for improvement in the services provided to graduates by the College and the Alumnae Association centered on opportunities for graduate study while those of the non–modal respondents centered on non educational alumnae services.

Chapter 7

Suggestions for improvement of Questionnaire Two and for improvement in the functioning of the College and the Alumnae Association for the benefit of graduates are addressed in Chapter 7. It concludes with a listing of the things respondents considered significant that were not dealt with in Questionnaire Two.

CRITICISM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 39 Q Two: "Criticize the questionnaire and suggest improvements."

216 respondents did not respond to this question; 9 respondents stated they had no criticism or commented favorably on the questionnaire. This total of 225 (90.4% of 249 respondents) were considered to have found the questionnaire satisfactory, at least.

The nine favorable comments are presented here.

> The questionnaire seemed adequate in most areas. It was not confusing and very well written.
>
> Appears to be fairly comprehensive.
>
> All in all a very complete questionnaire.
>
> It was fun.
>
> Very complete and concise.
>
> Very thorough and concise.
>
> Thorough and fair.
>
> All questions seemed very direct and concise.

I am glad there was a question regarding why one is not now working. The only reason I am inactive now is that I have two children, ages 5 years and 15 months, and I do think my place is in the home now. Without this question, one might think I did not enjoy nursing and plan some day to return to it. At such time as my family will not be inconvenienced by my working, I will definitely return to nursing.

CRITICISM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The criticisms of the questionnaire are presented here.

Directions and/or questions were not clear, repetitious, too time consuming.

Not clear on all questions.

Directions were sometimes confusing as to what questions to skip.

Question 23 was a mind boggler.

Questionnaire format is confusing. Maybe an indented format would be better for questions in 2 directions like #22 and #26.

Question 27 might be made a little more clear if choices were numbered or lettered.

Some of the questions could be combined.

It would take too long to list the answers to questions on page 7. (Questions 31–35). I did not take the time.

Timing of the questionnaire.

If this questionnaire is to be used again (5 years hence) please send it nearer the end of the year.

It was difficult to keep in mind that information wanted was from after 1972 in this one.

It was difficult to remember a five year period. Significant information might be left out.

Inadequacies of the questionnaire.

You state (in cover letter) that this questionnaire is being used to "poll graduates about their activities since leaving the college of nursing." You must mean their nursing activities, since nothing else is included.

I wish the questionnaire did not make me feel so guilty for choosing to remain out of nursing while my children are small. When they are older and in school, I do plan to either work or go back to school.

Regarding question 19, reasons for not being employed in nursing at time of answwering Questionnaire One, Graduate study should be one of the options as this is not employment in nursing but it certainly takes time and involvement.

The primary concern that comes to mind is that, for example, questions 28 and 29, would tend to indicate that one felt conditions or situations were felt to exist which could be changed to alter one's own feelings regarding the profession. Another side enters here – that of better self–awareness, of one's own personality and emotional suitability for satisfaction in another type of work or profession. But since I am not considering returning to work until after the children are reared – or accident or death of husband necessitates it – it is extremelydifficult to know whether I would return to some area of nursing. Also, all nursing service opportunities are in a city 30 miles away – and, I understand, are not terribly lucrative. Dangers of being on the streets during most shift changes also are another deterring factor.

The questionnaire did not direct any questions as to how those who are presently employed evaluate the work they are doing.

It does not ask reasons for job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

The questionnaire seems to be slanted toward those who have advanced their education, without asking those who have not, the reasons for that.

Questions 28, 29, and 30 should have had a line available for explanation since the reasons for selections would be more helpful than the vague answers alone.

Errors in questionnaire/mailings.

I do not understand why the school has me listed as graduating in 1960and 1965. I graduated in May, 196-. My current address is. . .

Many respondents corrected a spelling error in Question 5 and noted omissions and repetitions in Question 23.

Question judged inappropriate.

Question 27 has no place in a professional survey. People in this country are no longer neatly divided into three classes.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Suggestions for improvement of questionnaire are listed here.

I think it would be interesting to see what kind of people we are, as nursing graduates who have become a vital part of many communities. We are a socially aware profession.

I think it would be interesting to know why some areas of specialization are attractive to an individual.

You might inquire about services rendered to the community related to nursing. Free time given in some capacity such as Cancer Clinic (not as a nurse but still involved in a health field.)

It might be helpful to ask a question concerning reasons people remain inactive.

Further investigation into reasons for dissatisfaction with nursing as a career needs to be pursued.

OTHER RESPONSES

Other responses.

I hope I have been helpful to the study in some way. I just pretty much stay home and care for my family.

It looks just like some of the tests I took while at UTCN.

I will be interested in seeing the results of the questionnaires. What is the focus of your survey? progress in nursing career? influence of personal life?

Share the purposes and results with us. Ask us now in retrospect, for an evaluation of our curriculum and learning experiences at U.T.C.N.

Give me feedback on any questionnaire that I fill out. It would specifically interest me to know how many are still in nursing.

Seven additional respondents made this request and comment:

Please send me a copy of the findings or the report when completed. I would be interested in seeing the results.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING SERVICES TO GRADUATES FROM COLLEGE AND ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION

Question 40 Q Two: "Indicate ways in which the College of Nursing and the Alumnae Association could be more useful to you."

The 51 responses that were recorded are listed here. Unless otherwise indicated, each response represents one respondent. One respondent made two responses.

Continuing and graduate education.

Give graduates a chance to have a voice in the types of programs on the master's level.

Make graduate study available on a part time basis.

Expand graduate education on master's level.

I would like to have detailed information about the new UT program to prepare nurse educators and to grant a master's degree.

I hope the curriculum includes courses that would help a new graduate be better prepared to be a school nurse if she so desired.

Provide a progressive master's degree program to allow teachers to get master's degrees in a minimum of time; consider an external degree program.

Provide a progressive B.S. degree program for RNs (graduates of AD and Diploma programs) to get B.S.N. in a minimum of time.

Keep alumnae more informed about things like graduate school.

Let's get a masters level program started, (I think there is one at Yale) for pediatric nurse practitioners.

Offer part time courses – night courses, etc. which lead to masters in nursing, especially in psychiatric nursing.

Offer courses for a master's degree where a person would not have to go full–time which is impossible with 4 children. If you have courses, please send brochures.

Make available a list of schools throughout the country with Master's Programs – state the area of nursing, e.g., med–surg nursing, psychiatric, cardiovascular, pediatric nursing, etc.

I would like any information you could send me about the graduate program. I'm interested in learning more about it. Is the GRE required to enroll?

A continuing refresher course by mail on the latest trends and changes in nursing would be most helpful, or perhaps even information on a subscription basis. I feel completely inadequate as a nurse, professionally.

Information on refresher courses.

I am interested in information about short term seminars, institutes and/or continuing education courses. I would like to be prepared for future employment, when and if an attractive opportunity is available.

Conduct adult education courses similar to UT Extension Service. Give college credits at night or on Saturday for courses in specific nursing areas or nursing related areas.

Begin to bring continuing education programs on nursing to areas such as UT at Martin.

Let me know when they are having short courses which would be available to me as I feel continuing education is very important. Especially, I would like to see something offered in East Tennessee – regional programs would be great. (2 respondents)

Send me some information on your general curriculum – what approaches you are using in teaching skills and theory.

Continuing education.

Advice and assistance to staff members (hospital staff nurses) regarding further education.

Keep alumnae more informed about things like short term courses.

I have ofter wondered if there are correspondence courses available for us mommies who are unable to work, or go to clinics for refresher courses, in general or specialty nursing. Having a B.S. I would like to expand my credits in maternal child nursing and take a general refresher course, but I cannot travel to a city for any length of time. If correspondence courses are available for the B.S. graduate, the college could make such information available periodically.

Please tell me the best way to refresh my mind and learn new techniques, machinery, equipment, etc. when I decide to return to nursing full time.

Changes in current curriculum

Teach students that hospitals contain patients who require professional nursing care twenty–four hours a day, seven days a week, that this care cannot be "someone else's" responsiblility eternally.

AlumnaeNewsletter and activities

Since I live so far away (1,000 miles) I feel very much "removed" from all that's going on. I have suggested previously that I would appreciate having one of the current caps from our school. I don't even know what style they are. I don't know what the cost would be but perhaps the Alumnae would be happy to buy a little bit of tangible symbol of our school of nursing.

Get my name and address correct. (2 respondents)

Could a list of nursing alumnae in an individual's area be obtained?

I have missed the last two Alumnae Days because of the date. A Saturday in June or April is preferrable.

Have Alumnae Day on another day than Saturday.

Schedule Alumnae Day after school (public school) is out.

Hold Alumnae Day in June – middle. I am unable to attend in May.

Help me keep better in touch. Arrange some summer Alumnae meetings to make attendance more feasible for those of us with school children to consider and out of state travel problems. It is absolutely impossible for my family to plan a trip in May and financially impossible for me to fly to Memphis and back for just one day!

Keep in touch.

Since many women will continue to assume the role of fulltime wife and mother, it seems that more interest might be shown in how well a nurse feels she is prepared for these roles and perhaps how she might carry out these dual responsibilities effectively. This is not a criticism – I just know that many women like myself feel frustrated at not being able to do both jobs at one time, (I mean home making and nursing full–time).

Review and recommend new textbooks as they become available.

I believe, when they know your address, they should include, with any communication to you, a list of schools in your area at which you can work toward a higher degree in nursing. I believe this would encourage advanced education.

The Newsletters, etc., have been most informative.

I think you'll (y'all?) do a great job. I hope to come to an annual meeting soon. I have been too busy "playing mama" in the past. I have three children aged 5½, 3½, 1½.

No complaints. Still appreciate and have pride in UTCN – proud to be an alumnus.

I find the correspondence very adequate.

From the few things I have received, it sounds as if there have been quite a few changes in the program. I would appreciate a "Newsletter" biannually regarding the U.T.C.N.

I did not realize the Alumnae Association had any specific connection to this questionnaire.

I have not been receiving the Newsletter from the Medical Units or the Nursing Alumnae Day Letters. I was very surprised to return to Memphis for the first time in a few years and see a parking lot at the old nursing building.

I receive NO alumnae news and would like to very much. I do not even receive Centergrams from U.T. not even at my parents address.

I have not received a Centergram or other information for several years. I have been asked questions about UTCN by student nurses but have not always been able to adequately answer then due to lack of information.

You should publish a list of each class of graduates' current or most recent addresses and send it to each graduate.

Keep me more in touch with former friends and classmates by a newsy newsletter. Let us know what is happening at the College.

Newsletters which include growth of school and/or College and new program developments would be appreciated.

SIGNIFICANT THINGS OMITTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 38 Q Two: "Please report anything that is significant to you that the questionnaire has not included."

The 45 responses that were recorded are listed here. Unless otherwise indicated, each response represents one respondent. Some respondents made more than one response.

Things That There was no Chance to Report

Employment lasting less than one year

I was, for half a year, a clinical instructor part–time in an ADN program.

Courses taken – non–credit

After an absence of eleven years (while caring for young children, I took an excellent refresher course and have since been employed at first part–time and now full–time.

I have taken short courses in coronary care and post op cardiac surgical nursing in the area where I have been working 4 of the past 5 years.

Workshops given

I participated as a group discussion leader at a workshop of the Boston Society for Gerontologic Psychiatry, Inc.

Participation in projects

I was involved, for 2 quarters, in a federally funded curriculum revision project at a Community College.

Awards received

Selected as an Outstanding Educator of America in 1975 in recognition of higher education and service to the community.

Included in Tennessee Lives, 1971.

Kappa Delta Pi Honorary Educational Society.

Sigma Theta Tau (Beta Theta) (three respondents)

Sigma Theta Tau (Alpha Theta)

Accomplishments not related directly to nursing

I have developed speaking ability in Spanish.

Plans to continue education in non–nursing

I have applied to the graduate school in Psychology at M.S.U.

The value of having been educated in nursing aside from its use as a means of being employed

I am a plain, simple sort of person, not ambitous educationally or socially. I thank the Lord for my nursing education; I'm very aware I did not pay attention half the time. Often, I think I would like to go through training again. I am thankful for my training that I can perform a service that is necessary.

Even though I have not been actively employed, I have continued to appreciate my nursing background. I occasionally help in "mass immunization clinics", as the "neighborhood consultant" and, on several occasions, I have worked as my husband's office nurse.

Although it might be considered, since I have no intention of ever working professionally again, that my education in nursing has been wasted, I do not feel that this is true. Besides contributing to my marital stability, (my husband is a pediatrician), and directly contributing to my abilities as a mother, in this country where public education in health matters is practically non–existent, I feel that my knowledge and advice based on my nursing education, has directly influenced (and will continue to influence) a rather wide circle of friends and acquaintances. I believe that I have actually done more real education in maternal and child–family health in this unofficial, non–paying position, than I could ever do as a conventional registered nurse.

The ways graduates who do not work in nursing, serve as volunteers

Red Cross Nursing has fulfilled many of my needs to stay in some volunteer area of nursing. I teach mother and baby care classes and give injections to patients confined at home under a doctor's direction.

I am not gainfully employed as a nurse, but I do work as a nurse, ocassionally in my husband's office. I am also active in nursing with the Girl Scouts. I have been the nurse at Day Camps and on camping trips.

I feel my nursing background has been most helpful to me in serving as a volunteer in various community organizations with which I now work – particularly the American Cancer Society and the County Medical Auxiliary.

I feel nursing has prepared me to deal with brain damaged psychiatric patients to a degree that I am loving volunteer work on such a ward at the local VA hospital. I am one of four who work on this all male ward. We are able to give much more individual care to the men that the nurses can.

The fact that graduates continue to be interested in nursing though not actively engaged in it

After nursing one child through a terminal illness, I believe I could return to some types of nursing situations with little difficulty.

After 4 years of being a "housewife", I have decided that nursing is more fun and I will probably return to work in the near future. I ranked my reasons for the change I made from active to inactive status – Question 20, in the order of their importance to me at the time I quit working. The reason I ranked in 3rd place then would be in 1st place now, namely, "Hourly schedule required in nursing practice was a determining factor.

Although I am very anxious to get back into my nursing career, family obligations keep me from returning at present. However, more and more, I feel my life needs to be more productive and nursing will fill this need for me. It is a wonderful profession, and to lose nursing skills and knowledge would be a sin.

The significance of part–time employment in nursing

Maybe more information should be requested in the questionnaire about part–time employment, i.e., types of positions, frequency of employment, reasons for working part time. This is important since part time employment seems to be a way for some of us to keep in touch with nursing.

Attractive aspects of returning to employment

Return to employment after taking a refresher course – I find it to be one of the most fulfilling and rewarding experiences of my life. Someday I plan to go into teaching but for the present I am enjoying doing "floor duty". My children are teenagers and still require supervision and care so I am not yet involved in (added professional) organizations. That will come later.

My present position as Inservice Education Coordinator in a General Hospital offers contact with nursing approximately 50% of the time, but also allows me to understand and work directly with administration to provide education to all departments in the hospital.

Rapidity with which graduates become outdated if they are inactive

The longer I stay out of nursing the greater the change in nursing practices. Even in four years, so much has changed, it would take a year of study to catch up. I could never walk in to care for a patient, feeling that my professional knowledge and skills were inadequate to give the type of care the patient has the right to expect and to receive.

Attitudes toward the relationship of children in the family and employment in nursing

There could be a question included such as "Do you have plans for returning to nursing when your children are school age?" Answer: Yes for me.

Speaking of children in the family and the working or non– working mother: I miss nursing, or I should say, I miss the O.R. but the baby and her growth and development come first. There are important questions to be answered concerning children, particularly young children in the family. The answers can drastically change ones attitudes towards working full–time or part–time. I enjoy working when the hospital needs me in special areas, but it has taken my husband some time to realize this. I guess I should be thankful that our, or rather his income is sufficient so we do not miss my $15,060+ income too much.

Changes in attitudes of the graduate

It might be interesting to study changes in attitudes of the nurse herself as she grows older, e.g., why she stays in nursing or leaves to pursue other interests, also what she is satisfied or dissatisfied with in nursing.

Attractive aspects of nursing in general, currently, compared with the past

Nursing is more attractive now than when I entered it because of the upgrading of the profession, wider acceptance of and esteem for the nurse on the part of the public and present economic and social factors making the health fields more attractive.

Satisfaction with preparation received at UTCN

I cherish all the memories of UT. The school has made great strides forward and I am indeed proud to be an alumnus.

I was well prepared for my nursing profession by the faculty and curriculum at UTCN. I am proud of my association with UTCN.

Reasons or Explanations There was no Chance to Describe

Reasons for not being employed in nursing

Part time help is not wanted in some hospitals – particularly if you need to work a day shift because of family obligations. As a doctor, my husbands hours don't allow for both parents to be away from home at night.

It is my opinioh that nursing could attract many inactive nurses to part time work if hospitals offered hours more compatible with school schedules, e.g., 9 a.m. to 2 p.m., Monday through Friday. I want to be at home with my family at least until my youhgest child is in school. School here is dismissed at 2:30 p.m.. Household help and child care are not easily available here.

Why am I not presently employed? Unless you wish to work full time, there is little attraction in employment. The pay is unattractive and there is continuous pressure from employers to work full time.

I have two small children and a husband who has long and irregular working hours which prevent me from working in nursing at this time.

I feel more nurses with children would be working if hospital hours were more flexible and allowed for school aged children. With a work shift starting at 7 a.m. there isn't any way you can see your child off to school. Help at that time in the morning is impossible to find.

I am sure hospitals would have more nurses like me who want to work but don't need to, if they could be a bit more flexible.

Reasons that could be included as options in Question #20 are: the low status of nursing among physicians, lack of willingness among nurse administrators to accept changes in nursing, discrepancy between what is described as "ideal" in practice of nursing as a profession and what is actually practiced. I have been unable to find part time employment suitable to my needs in relation to working hours and minimum days of employment.

Since I have not been employed in nursing, I have discovered that I have many other talents which I did not have time to pursue while I was working; thus my decreased interest in nursing. I would still pursue nursing if the health department here was the caliber of the one in Memphis. I loved it.

The job satisfaction in part time nursing, I found to be poor.

Reasons for change in husband's attitude toward wife's employment in nursing

The change from favorable to unfavorable is not a reflection on nursing as unsuitable employment. It is strictly on the basis of no financial need and the feeling of both of us that husband and family come before career. There are no "women libbers" in this household.

Reasons for not pursuing post BSN studies

My lack of participation in educational activities is due to geographic limitations. I live in a small town a hundred miles from opportunities.

I have not continued work toward a masters degree because it was not possible in the areas where I was working. Since June, 1973 we have moved to an area where study will be possible.

Reasons for relatively rapid changes in employment

> My husband has been in the Army much of the period covered by this Questionnaire. This explains the brevity of my employment at various institutions.

This list of 45 things that respondents considered significant to them but which Q Two did not include indicated that

two of the criticisms of Q Two that were made in responses to Question 39 namely, that it was slanted toward those respondents who were active in nursing and those who had continued their formal education in nursing were supported by these responses to Question 38;

approximately half of all the things respondents identified as significant to them, but had had no chance to report, had to do with with their lives as persons but not full–time employed nurses. In the opinion of the writers, the responses that support this view were those classified under these headings:

- *Accomplishments not related directly to nursing*
- *Plans to continue education in non–nursing*
- *The value of having been educated in nursing, aside from its use as a means of being employed*
- *The ways in which graduates who do not work in nursing serve as volunteers*
- *The fact that graduates continue to be interested in nursing though not actively engaged in it*
- *The significance of part–time employment in nursing*
- *Attractive aspects of returning to employment*
- *Rapidity with which graduates become outdated if they are inactive*
- *Attitudes toward the relationship of children in the family and employment in nursing*
- *Reasons for not being employed in nursing*
- *Reasons for not pursuing post B.S.N. studies*

APPENDIX

Table A 1. Percent of Responses for 7 Categories of Occupations of Fathers of Respondents, by Class.

		Occupations of Fathers													
	Responses	Professions		Proprietor, Business Official		Salesman, Clerical Worker, Technician		Skilled Operator, Service Worker		Farm Owner		Farm Worker, Laborer		Retired, Deceased, "Other"	
Class	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	23	2	8.7	10	43.4	2	8.6	3	13.0	6	26.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1955	20	3	15.0	6	30.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	2	10.0
1956	32	4	12.5	8	25.0	4	12.6	4	12.6	11	34.4	0	0.0	1	3.1
1957	27	1	3.7	6	22.2	3	11.1	7	25.9	4	14.8	2	7.4	4	14.8
1958	35	5	14.3	13	37.2	3	8.7	2	5.8	6	17.1	4	11.4	2	5.7
1959	19	4	21.0	4	21.0	4	21.1	2	10.5	4	21.0	1	5.3	0	0.0
1960	20	2	10.0	7	35.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	0	0.0
1961	19	3	15.8	4	21.1	6	31.6	3	15.8	1	5.3	0	0.0	2	10.6
1962	22	2	9.1	9	40.9	2	9.1	5	22.7	1	4.5	1	4.5	2	9.1
1963	6	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	20	4	20.0	8	40.0	1	5.0	2	10.0	3	15.0	2	0.0	0	0.0
1965	20	7	35.0	10	50.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.0
1966	28	6	21.4	13	46.5	5	17.9	2	7.1	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	3.6
1967	11	3	27.3	4	36.4	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	0	0.0
1968	37	6	16.2	14	37.8	11	29.1	3	8.1	3	8.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1969	30	5	16.7	12	40.0	7	23.3	4	13.3	1	3.3	1	3.3	0	0.0
1970	37	9	24.3	9	24.3	8	20.8	9	24.3	1	2.7	1	2.7	0	0.0
1971	31	4	12.9	9	29.2	7	22.6	6	19.3	3	9.7	1	3.7	1	3.2
1972	22	6	27.3	3	13.6	6	27.2	2	9.0	3	13.6	1	4.5	1	4.5
1973	23	7	30.4	6	26.1	3	13.0	3	13.0	1	4.3	2	8.7	1	4.3
1974	40	6	15.0	15	37.5	5	12.7	5	12.5	2	5.0	1	2.5	6	15.0
Total	522	92	AV 17.6	171	AV 32.8	87	AV 16.7	71	AV 13.6	56	AV 10.7	20	AV 3.8	25	AV 4.8

Table A 2. Percent of Responses for 4 Categories of Occupations of Mothers of Respondents by Class

		Occupations of Mothers							
	Responses	Professions		Proprietor, Business Official		Saleswoman, Clerical Worker, Technician		Skilled Operator, Service Worker	
Class		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	11	4	36.4	1	9.1	3	27.3	3	27.3
1955	7	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	42.9	2	28.6
1956	15	5	33.3	2	13.3	5	33.3	3	20.0
1957	11	3	27.3	1	9.1	3	27.3	4	36.4
1958	11	6	54.5	0	0.0	4	36.7	1	9.1
1959	10	3	30.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
1960	6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
1961	8	4	50.0	1	12.5	2	25.0	1	12.5
1962	10	4	40.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	0	0.0
1963	7	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	42.9	2	28.6
1964	9	3	33.3	1	11.1	4	44.4	1	11.1
1965	6	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	0	0.0
1966	10	5	50.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	0	0.0
1967	8	3	37.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	1	12.5
1968	22	10	45.5	3	13.6	9	40.9	0	0.0
1969	16	5	31.3	1	6.3	10	62.5	0	0.0
1970	18	6	33.3	3	16.7	7	38.9	2	11.1
1971	15	2	13.3	1	6.7	8	53.3	4	26.7
1972	12	1	8.3	1	8.3	8	66.7	2	16.7
1973	12	2	16.7	2	16.7	6	50.0	2	16.7
1974	24	5	20.8	0	0.0	12	50.0	7	29.2
Total	248	78	AV 31.5	26	AV 10.5	103	AV 41.5	41	AV 16.5

Table A 3. Average Points for 7 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers and by Mothers of Respondents, by Class and by 2 Decade Groupings of Classes.

		Education Completed FATHER								
		Grade School	Some High School	High School Graduate	Tech/Voc. Graduate RN	Some College	College Graduate	Post Graduate		
		POINTS								
Class	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	AV
1954	23	3	20	6	4	30	0	7	70	3.04
1955	19	3	16	0	0	10	24	14	67	3.52
1956	33	8	16	9	4	50	0	21	108	3.27
1957	26	7	10	24	8	10	12	0	71	2.84
1958	34	6	22	12	8	30	18	14	110	3.23
1959	20	5	6	9	0	30	18	0	68	3.40
1960	20	4	6	12	4	15	24	7	72	3.60
1961	20	4	4	24	0	10	18	7	67	3.35
1962	22	1	8	30	8	5	12	14	78	3.54
1963	7	2	0	3	0	5	12	7	29	4.14
1964	20	1	4	21	0	25	12	21	84	4.20
1965	20	1	0	12	12	20	30	21	96	4.80
1966	28	1	14	15	4	35	30	14	113	4.03
1967	12	0	8	3	0	5	18	21	55	4.58
1968	36	3	6	30	4	30	42	42	157	4.36
1969	32	4	8	30	8	30	12	28	120	3.75
1970	36	2	14	36	8	20	30	28	138	3.83
1971	29	3	6	15	4	45	24	28	125	4.31
1972	22	3	8	10	4	15	24	35	99	4.50
1973	24	2	6	18	4	20	24	28	102	4.25
1974	40	2	12	45	8	30	30	28	155	3.87
Total	523	65	194	364	92	470	414	385	1984	3.79
Classes										
1954 - 64	244	44	112	150	36	220	150	112	824	3.37
1965 - 74	279	21	82	214	56	250	264	273	1160	4.15

Table A 3. Average Points for 7 Levels of Education Completed by Fathers and by Mothers of Respondents, by Class and by 2 Decade Groupings
(Continued) of Classes.

		Education Completed MOTHER								
		Grade School	Some High School	High School Graduate	Tech/Voc. Graduate RN	Some College	College Graduate	Post Graduate		
		POINTS								
Class	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	AV
1954	23	2	10	18	8	25	18	0	81	3.52
1955	19	1	10	21	8	5	12	7	64	3.36
1956	33	3	12	36	24	10	24	0	109	3.30
1957	27	3	18	12	8	35	6	7	89	3.29
1958	34	4	10	33	8	50	12	0	117	3.44
1959	20	2	8	18	4	25	6	7	70	3.50
1960	20	1	6	21	12	20	12	0	72	3.60
1961	20	4	6	12	4	25	12	7	70	3.50
1962	22	0	10	24	8	20	12	7	81	3.68
1963	7	1	2	9	4	5	0	0	21	3.00
1964	20	2	4	12	12	25	24	0	79	3.95
1965	20	2	2	24	4	10	30	7	79	3.95
1966	28	2	2	21	24	35	6	28	118	4.21
1967	12	0	6	6	12	15	0	7	46	3.83
1968	37	1	2	36	28	40	42	7	156	4.21
1969	32	2	6	30	32	35	12	0	117	3.65
1970	37	3	12	24	28	45	12	14	138	3.72
1971	30	4	4	27	12	30	12	28	117	3.90
1972	22	2	4	9	16	30	30	0	91	4.13
1973	24	2	12	18	20	15	12	0	79	3.29
1974	41	1	10	33	28	55	18	21	165	4.04
Total	528	42	156	444	304	555	312	147	1960	3.71
Classes 1954 - 64	245	23	96	216	100	245	138	35	853	3.48
1965 - 74	283	19	60	228	204	310	174	112	1107	3.91

Table A 4 Percent of Responses for Sources of Financial Aid for Generic Program Respondents, by Class

	Generic Program Respondents	Sources of Financial Assistance							
		Available through UTCN		Available through Other Sources		Part-Time Employment		No Financial Aid Rec'd.	
Class	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	20	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	17	85.0
1955	16	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	13	81.3
1956	32	1	3.1	1	3.1	5	15.6	25	78.1
1957	21	0	0.0	2	9.5	2	9.5	17	80.9
1958	27	0	0.0	1	3.7	6	22.2	20	74.1
1959	17	0	0.0	3	17.6	1	5.9	13	76.5
1960	18	3	16.7	4	22.2	2	11.1	9	50.0
1961	16	0	0.0	6	37.5	3	18.6	7	43.8
1962	20	1	5.0	7	35.0	6	30.0	6	30.0
1963	6	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	4	66.7
1964	13	1	7.7	2	15.4	2	15.4	8	61.5
1965	16	1	6.3	5	31.3	2	12.5	8	50.1
1966	22	8	36.4	1	4.5	3	13.6	10	45.5
1967	11	7	63.6	2	18.2	1	9.1	1	9.1
1968	32	6	18.8	8	25.0	2	6.3	16	50.0
1969	26	11	42.3	4	15.4	2	7.7	9	34.6
1970	35	17	48.6	5	14.3	2	5.7	11	31.4
1971	19	5	26.3	3	15.8	1	5.3	10	52.6
1972	17	6	35.3	2	11.8	4	23.5	5	29.4
1973	19	4	21.1	0	0.0	2	10.5	13	68.4
1974	29	3	10.3	5	17.2	7	24.1	14	48.3
Total	432	77	AV 17.8	63	AV 14.6	56	AV 13.0	236	AV 54.6

Table A 5. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage Related to First Enrollment by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class

Generic Program

Class	Respondents N	Before Enrollment in UTCN %	Before Senior Year %	During Senior Year %	Within One Year After Graduation %	One to Three Years After Graduation %	More Than Three Years After Graduation
1954	18	0.0	11.1	16.7	38.9	11.1	22.2
1955	16	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	18.8	18.8
1956	31	0.0	16.1	12.9	35.5	19.4	16.1
1957	20	0.0	10.0	30.0	15.0	35.0	10.0
1958	25	0.0	28.0	12.0	20.0	24.0	16.0
1959	14	0.0	14.3	7.1	57.1	14.3	7.1
1960	17	0.0	29.4	23.5	17.6	11.7	17.6
1961	16	0.0	6.3	37.5	25.0	0.0	31.3
1962	14	0.0	28.6	14.3	42.9	7.1	7.1
1963	3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0
1964	12	8.3	25.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	0.0
1965	11	9.1	27.3	9.1	45.5	9.1	x.x
1966	14	7.1	35.7	7.1	42.9	7.1	x.x
1967	9	0.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	x.x
1968	27	0.0	11.1	3.7	59.3	25.9	x.x
1969	26	0.0	11.5	15.4	53.8	19.2	x.x
1970	24	4.2	25.0	16.7	29.1	25.0	x.x
1971	17	0.0	41.2	0.0	29.4	29.4	x.x
1972	17	11.8	47.1	5.9	23.5	11.8	x.x
1973	15	20.0	6.7	6.7	40.0	26.7	x.x
1974	21	9.5	4.8	9.5	61.9	14.3	x.x
Total	367	AV 3.0	19.3	14.7	36.5	18.8	7.6

x.x This option was not applicable for respondents in Classes 1965–1974 answering two years after graduation.

Table A 5. Percent of Responses for Time of First Marriage Related to First Enrollment by Respondents' UTCN Program and by Class (continued)

Registered Nurse Program

Class	Respondents N		Before Enrollment in UTCN %	Before Senior Year %	During Senior Year %	Within One Year After Graduation %	One to Three Years After Graduation %	More Than Three Years After Graduation %
1954	3		0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
1955	3		0.0	33.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
1956	1		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1957	3		33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
1958	6		66.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0
1959	3		0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
1960	2		50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
1961	2		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1962	1		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1963	1		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1964	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1965	4		25.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	x.x
1966	4		75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1967	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1968	2		50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	x.x
1969	3		0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.7	x.x
1970	1		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1971	5		40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	x.x
1972	2		50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	x.x
1973	2		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	x.x
1974	4		75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	x.x
Total	52	AV	42.3	7.7	5.8	25.0	15.4	3.8

x.x. This option was not applicable for respondents in Classes 1965–1974 answering two years after graduation.

Table A 6. Percent of Aggregate Score in Points Derived from Responses for 6 Reasons for Employment, by Class and Respondents' UTCN Program

Reasons for Employment Excluding Financial Reasons

Class	G–R Interval	Year of Response	Personal Fulfillment		Job Satisfaction		Service to others		Career Commitment		People I Meet		Scholarship or Traineeship Commitment	
			Gen Prog	RN Prog	Gen Prog	RN Prog	Gen Prog	RN Prog	Gen Prog	RN Prog	Gen Prog	RN Prog	Gen Prog	RN Prog
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1954	13	1967	32	00	24	00	16	00	14	00	09	00	03	00
1955	12	1967	25	29	19	17	21	14	13	22	16	14	04	02
1956	11	1967	26	33	20	26	22	40	12	00	15	00	02	00
1957	10	1967	24	30	24	21	23	25	13	12	10	08	03	01
1958	9	1967	24	28	24	16	20	22	16	14	10	13	03	04
1959	8	1967	23	28	26	23	20	14	16	14	10	14	04	04
1960	7	1967	24	23	25	28	24	09	06	19	14	14	03	04
1961	6	1967	22	28	19	18	28	02	11	28	16	10	02	10
1962	5	1967	27	19	23	14	18	04	13	23	13	09	03	28
1963	4	1967	22	28	37	23	18	19	07	14	11	04	03	09
1964	3	1967	22	21	17	24	21	23	15	10	16	14	06	04
1965	2	1967	23	26	21	21	20	28	15	12	15	07	05	05
1966	2	1968	24	23	20	21	18	18	17	12	14	07	04	17
1967	2	1969	24	00	20	00	20	00	14	00	13	00	07	00
1968	2	1970	24	25	19	22	22	24	12	12	15	11	05	03
1969	2	1971	27	24	17	17	22	24	12	09	13	13	07	09
1970	2	1972	24	28	20	14	21	19	14	23	13	09	04	04
1971	2	1973	25	23	21	21	18	18	16	20	13	11	05	05
1972	2	1974	24	23	22	15	18	17	16	22	13	11	04	09
1973	2	1975	24	28	23	19	20	19	14	17	13	12	05	03
1974	2	1976	27	18	19	22	19	17	17	22	12	08	04	09
Mean of percents			25.1	25.5	22.3	20.2	20.8	18.7	14.5	16.9	14.5	10.5	04.6	07.2

Table A 7. Percent of Responses for 3 ANA Membership Status Options by Respondents' UTCN Program, by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class.

		Generic Program							Registered Nurse Program						
	Grad–Resp. Int	Resp-ondents	Current Membership		Previous Membership		Never a Member		Resp-ondents	Current Member		Previous Member		Never a Member	
Class	Years	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	13	20	4	20.0	13	65.0	3	15.0	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
1955	12	17	5	29.4	12	70.6	0	0.0	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
1956	11	32	8	25.0	16	50.0	8	25.0	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1957	10	23	3	13.0	15	65.2	5	21.7	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
1958	9	27	8	29.6	9	33.3	10	37.0	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0.0
1959	8	17	8	47.1	7	41.2	2	11.8	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
1960	7	18	1	5.6	13	72.2	4	22.2	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
1961	6	17	3	17.6	7	41.2	7	41.2	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1962	5	21	6	28.6	8	38.1	7	33.3	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1963	4	6	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1964	3	15	5	33.3	6	40.0	4	26.7	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
1965	2	16	8	50.0	2	12.5	6	37.5	4	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
1966	2	22	7	31.8	7	31.8	8	36.4	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0
1967	2	12	7	58.3	1	8.3	4	33.3	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1968	2	34	16	47.1	9	26.5	9	26.5	3	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3
1969	2	26	7	26.9	8	30.8	11	42.3	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
1970	2	36	17	47.2	6	16.7	13	36.1	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
1971	2	24	14	58.3	3	12.5	7	29.2	8	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0
1972	2	19	6	31.6	6	31.6	7	36.8	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0
1973	2	21	8	38.1	1	4.8	12	57.1	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1974	2	33	12	36.4	1	3.0	20	60.6	8	7	87.5	0	0.0	1	12.5
Total		456	154	AV 33.8	154	AV 33.8	148	AV 32.5	76	49	AV 64.4	20	AV 26.3	7	AV 9.2
Averages 3-13 yrs.		N=213		AV 24.4		51.6		23.9	N=35		AV 60.0		37.1		2.9
Averages 2 yrs.		N=243		AV 42.0		18.1		39.9	N=41		AV 68.3		17.1		14.6

Table A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class.

Local Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Yrs.	N	N	Pts.	N	Pts.	N	Pts.	Total Pts.
1954	13	16	2	6	2	4	12	12	22
1955	12	15	2	6	3	6	10	10	22
1956	11	22	3	9	7	14	12	12	35
1957	10	17	3	9	3	6	11	11	26
1958	9	17	8	24	0	0	9	9	33
1959	8	13	0	0	1	2	12	12	14
1960	7	13	0	0	4	8	9	9	17
1961	6	10	0	0	4	8	6	6	14
1962	5	14	1	3	7	14	6	6	23
1963	4	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	6
1964	3	10	1	3	3	6	6	6	15
1965	2	10	1	3	2	4	7	7	14
1966	2	14	1	3	1	2	12	12	17
1967	2	8	1	3	3	6	4	4	13
1968	2	25	1	3	6	12	18	18	33
1969	2	14	0	0	1	2	13	13	15
1970	2	20	0	0	4	8	16	16	24
1971	2	18	0	0	1	2	17	17	19
1972	2	11	0	0	2	4	9	9	13
1973	2	9	1	3	2	4	6	6	13
1974	2	12	0	0	2	4	10	10	14
Total		293	25	75	59	118	209	209	402
				18.7% of 402		29.4% of 402		52.0% of 402	39.0% of 1032

Table A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class.

(Continued)

State Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		Total
Class	Yrs.	N	N	Pts.	N	Pts.	N	Pts.	Pts.
1954	13	16	2	6	2	4	12	12	22
1955	12	15	0	0	3	6	12	12	18
1956	11	22	0	0	0	0	22	22	22
1957	10	17	1	3	2	4	14	14	21
1958	9	17	1	3	7	14	9	9	26
1959	8	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13
1960	7	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13
1961	6	10	1	3	1	2	8	8	13
1962	5	14	0	0	2	4	12	12	16
1963	4	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5
1964	3	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1965	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1966	2	14	0	0	1	2	13	13	15
1967	2	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10
1968	2	25	0	0	0	0	25	25	25
1969	2	14	0	0	1	2	13	13	15
1970	2	20	1	3	1	2	18	18	23
1971	2	18	1	3	0	0	17	17	20
1972	2	11	0	0	1	2	10	10	12
1973	2	9	0	0	0	0	9	9	9
1974	2	12	0	0	2	4	10	10	14
Total		293	7	21	25	50	261	261	332
				6.3% of 332		15.1% of 332		78.6% of 332	32.2% of 1032

Table A 8. Percent of Total Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class (Continued)

National Association

	G–R Int	Resp-ondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			Grand Total
Class	Yrs.	N	N		N	Pts.	N	Pts.	Pts.	
1954	13	16	1	3	0	0	15	15	18	62
1955	12	15	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	55
1956	11	22	0	0	0	0	22	22	22	79
1957	10	17	0	0	1	2	16	16	18	65
1958	9	17	0	0	1	2	16	16	18	77
1959	8	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13	40
1960	7	13	0	0	0	0	13	13	13	43
1961	6	10	0	0	1	2	9	9	11	38
1962	5	14	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	53
1963	4	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	16
1964	3	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	35
1965	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	34
1966	2	14	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	46
1967	2	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	31
1968	2	25	0	0	0	0	25	25	25	83
1969	2	14	0	0	0	0	14	14	14	44
1970	2	20	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	67
1971	2	18	0	0	0	0	18	18	18	57
1972	2	11	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	36
1973	2	9	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	31
1974	2	12	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	40
Total		293	1	3	3	6	289	289	298	1032
				1.0% of 298		2.0% of 298		97.0% of 298	28.9% of 1032	

Table A 9. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Level by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class.

Local Association

	G–R Int	Res- pondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	3	2	6	0	0	1	1	7
1955	12	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1956	11	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1957	10	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1958	9	8	4	12	3	6	1	1	19
1959	8	3	1	3	0	0	2	2	5
1960	7	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	4
1961	6	4	4	12	0	0	0	0	12
1962	5	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1963	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1964	3	5	1	3	2	4	2	2	9
1965	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1966	2	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	8
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1969	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	7
1972	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1973	2	3	0	0	3	6	0	0	6
1974	2	8	1	3	2	4	5	5	12
Total		69	13	39 33.3% of 117	22	44 37.6% of 117	34	34 29.1% of 117	117 40.3% of 290

Table A 9. Percent of Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Level by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class.
(Continued)

State Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	3	0	0	2	4	1	1	5
1955	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1956	11	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
1957	10	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1958	9	8	2	6	4	8	2	2	16
1959	8	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4
1960	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1961	6	4	2	6	2	4	0	0	10
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1964	3	5	1	3	1	2	3	3	8
1965	2	3	1	3	0	0	2	2	5
1966	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1969	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	8
1972	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1973	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
1974	2	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10
Total		69	7	21 21.2% of 99	16	32 32.3% of 99	46	46 46.4% of 99	99 34.1% of 290

Table A 9. (Continued) Percent of Points for Participation in ANA on Local, State and National Level by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class.

National Association

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts	Grand Total Pts
1954	13	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	16
1955	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	10
1956	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6
1957	10	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	10
1958	9	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10	45
1959	8	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	12
1960	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	9
1961	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	26
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1964	3	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	6	23
1965	2	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	13
1966	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	20
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1969	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	14
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	21
1972	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9
1973	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	12
1974	2	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	30
Total		69	0	0	5	10	64	64	74	290
				0% of 74		13.5% of 74		86.5% of 74	25.5% of 290	

Table A 10. Percent of Responses for 3 NLN Membership Status Options, by Respondents' UTCN Program by 2 Graduation–Response Intervals and by Class

			Generic Program						Registered Nurse Program						
	G–R Interval		Current Member Responses		Previous Member Responses		Never a Member Responses			Current Member Responses		Previous Member Responses		Never a Member Responses	
Class	Years	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1954	13	19	2	10.5	7	36.8	10	52.6	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	00.0
1955	12	17	1	5.9	4	23.5	12	70.6	3	2	66.7	0	00.0	1	33.3
1956	11	31	6	19.4	5	12.1	20	64.5	1	0	00.0	1	100.0	0	00.0
1957	10	22	2	9.1	5	22.7	15	68.2	4	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
1958	9	27	4	14.8	7	25.9	16	59.3	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	00.0
1959	8	17	2	11.8	6	35.3	9	52.9	3	0	00.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
1960	7	17	2	11.8	2	11.8	13	76.5	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	00.0
1961	6	17	3	17.6	6	35.3	8	47.1	4	4	100.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1962	5	21	3	14.3	4	19.0	14	66.7	1	1	100.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1963	4	6	0	0.0	1	16.7	5	83.3	1	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	100.0
1964	3	14	0	0.0	1	7.1	13	92.9	5	2	40.0	0	00.0	3	60.0
1965	2	16	1	6.3	1	6.3	14	87.5	4	0	00.0	0	00.0	4	100.0
1966	2	22	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	100.0	6	0	00.0	1	16.7	5	83.3
1967	2	12	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7	0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1968	2	34	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	100.0	3	0	00.0	0	00.0	3	100.0
1969	2	26	1	3.8	0	0.0	25	96.2	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
1970	2	36	0	0.0	1	2.8	35	97.2	1	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	100.0
1971	2	24	0	0.0	13	54.2	11	45.8	8	0	00.0	4	50.0	4	50.0
1972	2	19	0	0.0	1	5.3	18	94.7	3	1	33.3	0	00.0	2	66.7
1973	2	21	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	100.0	3	0	00.0	1	33.0	2	66.7
1974	2	32	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	100.0	8	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5
Total		450	28	AV 6.2	64	AV 14.2	358	AV 79.6	75	22	AV 29.3	16	AV 21.3	37	AV 49.3
Averages, 3-13 yrs.		N=208		AV 12.0		AV 23.1		AV 64.9	N=34		AV 52.9		AV 23.5		AV 23.5
Averages, 2 yrs.		N=242		AV 1.2		AV 6.6		AV 92.1	N=41		AV 9.8		AV 19.5		AV 70.7

Table A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Generic Program Respondents, by Class

Local League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	8	1	3	1	2	6	6	11
1955	12	5	1	3	1	2	3	3	8
1956	11	11	2	6	2	4	7	7	17
1957	10	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	8
1958	9	10	1	3	3	6	6	6	15
1959	8	8	0	0	2	4	6	6	10
1960	7	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1961	6	9	2	6	1	2	6	6	14
1962	5	7	0	0	3	6	4	4	10
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1964	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1965	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1968	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1971	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1972	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1973	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1974	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		89	7	21	17	34	65	65	120
				17.5% of 120		28.3% of 120		54.2% of 120	37.4% of 321

Table A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by (Continued) Generic Program Respondents, by Class

State League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	8	1	3	1	2	6	6	11
1955	12	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	6
1956	11	11	1	3	1	2	9	9	14
1957	10	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	7
1958	9	10	1	3	3	6	6	6	15
1959	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8
1960	7	4	1	3	0	0	3	3	6
1961	6	9	1	3	1	2	7	7	12
1962	5	7	0	0	1	2	6	6	8
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1964	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1965	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1968	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1971	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1973	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1974	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		89	5	15	9	18	75	75	108
				13.9% of 108		16.7% of 108		69.4% of 108	33.6% of 321

Table A 11. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by
(Continued) Generic Program Respondents, by Class

National League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			Grand Total
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Pts	Pts
1954	13	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	30
1955	12	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	19
1956	11	11	1	3	0	0	10	10	13	44
1957	10	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	7	22
1958	9	10	0	0	1	2	9	9	11	41
1959	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	8	26
1960	7	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	15
1961	6	9	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	35
1962	5	7	0	0	0	0	7	7	7	25
1963	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1964	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1965	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1968	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1970	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1971	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	30
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1973	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1974	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		89	1	3	2	4	86	86	93	321
				3.2% of 93		4.3% of 93		92.5% of 93	29.0% of 321	

Table A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class

Local League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1955	12	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1956	11	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1957	10	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1958	9	8	4	12	3	6	1	1	19
1959	8	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1960	7	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	5
1961	6	4	3	9	1	2	0	0	11
1962	5	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
1963	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1964	3	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1965	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	5
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1973	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1974	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
Total		37	12	36	9	18	16	16	70
				51.4% of 70		25.7% of 70		22.9% of 70	41.2% of 170

Table A 12. Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class
(Continued)

State League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses		
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Total Pts
1954	13	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1955	12	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1956	11	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
1957	10	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1958	9	8	3	9	4	8	1	1	18
1959	8	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
1960	7	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
1961	6	4	0	0	4	8	0	0	8
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1963	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1964	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1965	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1973	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1974	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
Total		37	6	18	11	22	20	20	60
				30.0% of 60		36.7% of 60		33.3% of 60	35.3% of 170

Table A 12. (Continued) Percent of Total Points for Participation in NLN on Local, State and National Levels by Registered Nurse Program Respondents by Class

National League

	G–R Int	Respondents	Leader Responses		Active Responses		Minimal Responses			
Class	Years	N	N	Pts	N	Pts	N	Pts	Pts	Gran Tota Pts
1954	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	10
1955	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	9
1956	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6
1957	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	9
1958	9	8	0	0	3	6	5	5	11	48
1959	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	8
1960	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	11
1961	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	23
1962	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
1963	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1964	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	8
1965	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1966	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1967	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1968	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1969	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
1970	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1971	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	13
1972	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1973	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
1974	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	9
Total		37	0	0	3	6	34	34	40	170
			0	0% of 40		15.0% of 40		85.0% of 40	23.5% of 170	

Table A #13. Percent of Responses for *Occupation of Father By Modal and Non–modal Respondents and by 2 Groups of Classes

		Primary Occupation of Father										
		Profession	Proprietor	Business Official	Salesman	Clerical Worker	Farm Owner and Manager	Farm Worker	Technician Semi–Professional	Skilled Operator	Service Worker	Laborer
Modal Group	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	100	13.0	11.0	21.0	8.0	7.0	15.0	1.0	3.0	16.0	3.0	2.0
Classes 1954 1964	53	7.5	13.2	15.1	9.4	5.7	20.8	1.9	1.9	18.9	1.9	3.8
1965 1969	47	19.1	8.5	27.7	6.4	8.5	8.5	0.0	4.3	12.8	4.3	0.0
Non-Modal Group	N											
Total	116	20.7	25.9	14.7	6.0	2.6	8.6	0.0	6.0	9.5	2.6	3.4
Classes 1954 1964	84	15.5	23.8	17.8	4.8	2.4	10.7	0.0	5.9	11.9	3.6	3.
Classes 1965 1969	32	34.4	31.3	6.3	9.4	3.1	3.1	0.0	6.3	3.1	0.0	3.

*In this comparison the responses in the options "retired" and "dec eased" were tabulated according to the former occupation that was specified.

Table A 14 Percent of Responses for Modal and Non–modal Respondents for Age of Respondent and Ages of Children, Q One and Q Two

	Q One				Q Two			
	Modal	Group	Non–Modal	Group	Modal	Group	Non–Modal	Group
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Aged Under 25 never married	13	13.0	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Age 25–45 never married	17	17.0	3	2.5	21	21.0	2	1.7
Age 45–65 never married	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0
No children age under 25	23	23.0	16	13.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
No children age 25–45	15	15.0	10	8.4	17	17.0	3	2.5
All children under 30 months	6	6.0	14	11.8	9	9.0	5	4.2
Oldest child under 6 youngest under 30 Mos.	4	4.0	18	15.1	9	9.0	19	16.0
Oldest child under 13 youngest under 30 Mos.	2	2.0	12	10.1	4	4.0	12	10.1
All children ages 2½–6	8	8.0	17	14.3	15	15.0	11	9.2
Oldest under 13 youngest 2½–6	7	7.0	15	12.6	2	2.0	9	7.6
All children 6–13	5	5.0	9	7.6	9	9.0	27	22.7
Oldest children under 20 youngest under 2½	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	11	9.2
Oldest child under 20 youngest 2½–6	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.0	5	4.2
Oldest child under 20 youngest 6–13	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	6.0	8	6.7
All children ages 13–20	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.0	6	5.0
Oldest child left household youngest 2½–6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
TOTAL	100	100.0	119	100.0	100	100.0	119	99.9